

ATTACHMENT A

**REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED
UNDER SEAL**

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 Christopher S. Marchese (SBN 170239)
marchese@fr.com
2 [Tyler R. Train \(SBN 318998\)](#)
[train@fr.com](#)
3 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
4 633 West Fifth Street, 26th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
5 Tel: (213) 533-4240 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

6 Adam R. Shartzter (admitted *pro hac vice*)
shartzter@fr.com
7 Ruffin B. Cordell (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 cordell@fr.com
Richard A. Sterba (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 sterba@fr.com
Ralph A. Phillips (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10 rphillips@fr.com
Michael J. Ballanco (admitted *pro hac vice*)
11 ballanco@fr.com
Taylor C. Burgener (SBN 348769)
12 burgener@fr.com
13 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
14 1000 Maine Ave., SW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20024
15 Tel: (202) 783-5070 / Fax: (202) 783-2331

16 *Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page*

17 Attorneys for [Defendant](#)
18 [Dish Network California Service](#)
[Corp. Defendants and Counter-Claimants](#)
19

20 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
21 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

DISH NETWORK CORPORATION;
DISH NETWORK L.L.C.; DISH
NETWORK SERVICE L.L.C.; AND
DISH NETWORK CALIFORNIA
SERVICE CORPORATION,

Defendants.

DISH NETWORK CORPORATION;
DISH NETWORK L.L.C.; DISH
NETWORK SERVICE L.L.C.; DISH
NETWORK CALIFORNIA SERVICE
CORPORATION; AND DISH
TECHNOLOGIES, L.L.C.

Counter-
~~Claimant~~Claimants,

v.

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS,
LLC; MAXLINEAR, INC.; AND
MAXLINEAR COMMUNICATIONS
LLC,

Counter-Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-1043-JWH-KES

**DEFENDANTS DISH NETWORK
CORPORATION; DISH NETWORK
L.L.C; AND DISH NETWORK
SERVICE L.L.C.'S ANSWER,
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AND
COUNTERCLAIMS TO
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

**DEFENDANT DISH NETWORK
CALIFORNIA SERVICE CORP.'S
FIRST AMENDED ANSWER,
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AND
COUNTERCLAIMS TO
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

District Judge: Hon. John W. Holcomb
Magistrate Judge: Hon. Karen E. Scott

Complaint Filed: 2/10/2023

**DISH CALIFORNIA'S DISH'S ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE AND ADDITIONAL
DEFENSES, AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO COMPLAINT**

Case No. 2:23-cv-1043-JWH-KES

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ~~Defendant Dish Network California Service Corp.~~ (“Defendant” or “Dish
2 ~~California~~”) ~~by~~ By and through its attorneys, Defendants DISH Network Corporation;
3 DISH Network L.L.C.; and Dish Network Service L.L.C. (collectively “DISH
4 Colorado”) files ~~its~~ their Answer, Affirmative and Additional Defenses, and
5 Counterclaims to Plaintiff Entropic Communications, LLC’s (“Plaintiff” and
6 “Entropic”) Complaint for Patent Infringement; Defendant Dish Network California
7 Service Corp. (“Dish California”) files its First Amended Answer, Affirmative and
8 Additional Defenses, and First Amended Counterclaims to Plaintiff Entropic
9 Communications, LLC’s (“Plaintiff” and “Entropic”) Complaint for Patent
10 Infringement; and Counter-Claimant DISH Technologies L.L.C. (“DISH
11 Technologies”) files counterclaims against Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendants
12 MaxLinear, Inc. and MaxLinear Communications LLC.¹

ANSWER

13
14 DISH Colorado and Dish California ~~responds~~ (collectively, “DISH” or
15 “Defendants”) respond to the allegations contained in the numbered paragraphs of
16 Entropic’s Complaint below. ~~Dish California~~ DISH denies all allegations and
17 characterizations in Entropic’s Complaint unless expressly admitted in the following
18 paragraphs.

19 1. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
20 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, and therefore
21 denies them.

22
23
24
25 ¹ This combined filing represents the first answer, affirmative defenses, and
26 counterclaims filed by DISH Network Corporation; DISH Network L.L.C.; and
27 Dish Network Service L.L.C.; and the first amended answer, affirmative defenses,
28 and counterclaims filed by Dish Network California Service Corporation. For
convenience, each of these defendants provides its answer, affirmative defenses, and
counterclaims in this single filing.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

2. ~~Dish-California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

3. ~~Dish-California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

4. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies that it takes advantage of MoCA without paying appropriate licensing fees for the technology. ~~Dish-California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remainder of the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

5. The allegations of paragraph 5 contain legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required, ~~Dish-California~~DISH admits that Entropic purports to assert patent infringement claims against ~~Dish-California~~DISH involving U.S. Patent Nos. 7,295,518 (the “’518 Patent”), 7,594,249 (the “’249 Patent”); U.S. Patent Nos. 7,889,759 (the “’759 Patent”), 8,085,802 (the “’802 Patent”); U.S. Patent Nos. 9,838,213 (the “’213 Patent”), 10,432,422 (the “’422 Patent”); U.S. Patent Nos. 8,631,450 (the “’450 Patent”), 8,621,539 (the “’539 Patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,320,566 (the “’0,566 Patent”); U.S. Patent No. 10,257,566 (the “’7,566 Patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,228,910 (the “’910 Patent”); U.S. Patent No. 8,363,681 (the “’681 Patent”) (collectively all of the patents are referred to herein as the “Patents-in-Suit” or “Asserted Patents”). ~~Dish-California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether the patents incorporate various elements of technology set forth in the specifications of the Multimedia over Coax Alliance standards (which Entropic refers to as the “MoCA standards”), and therefore denies them.² ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies all remaining allegations of paragraph 5.

² Each version of the MoCA standards is referred to herein as “MoCA 1.0,” “MoCA 1.1,” and/or “MoCA 2.0.”

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

PARTIES

6. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 6, and therefore denies them.

7. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 7, and therefore denies them.

8. ~~Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of~~DISH admits the allegations ~~inof~~ paragraph 8,~~and therefore denies them.~~

9. ~~Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of~~DISH admits the allegations ~~inof~~ paragraph 9,~~and therefore denies them.~~

10. ~~Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of~~DISH admits the allegations ~~inof~~ paragraph 10,~~and therefore denies them.~~

11. ~~Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of~~DISH admits the allegations ~~inof~~ paragraph 11,~~and therefore denies them.~~

12. ~~Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of~~DISH admits the allegations ~~inof~~ paragraph 12,~~and therefore denies them.~~

13. ~~Dish California~~DISH admits the allegations of paragraph 13.

14. ~~Dish California~~DISH admits the allegations of paragraph 14.

15. Dish California admits that for Dish California, jurisdiction and venue is proper in this District. ~~For the remaining parties and allegations in paragraph 15, Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 15 and therefore denies them~~DISH Colorado denies that, for DISH Colorado, jurisdiction and venue is proper in this District.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

PRESUIT DISCUSSIONS

16. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as DISH admits that Entropic sent communications dated March 9, 2022; December 23, 2022; and January 2, 2023. As to the ~~truth of the~~ remaining allegations ~~in and characterizations of~~ paragraph 16, ~~and therefore~~ DISH denies them.

ENTROPIC'S LEGACY AS AN INNOVATOR

17. ~~Dish California~~ DISH denies that Entropic Communications, Inc. is the predecessor-in-interest to Entropic. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 17, and therefore denies them.

18. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 18, and therefore denies them.

19. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 19, and therefore denies them.

20. ~~Dish California~~ DISH denies that Entropic Inc. pioneered innovative networking technologies. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 20, and therefore denies them.

21. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 21, and therefore denies them.

22. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 22, and therefore denies them.

MOCA® AND THE MOCA® STANDARDS

23. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 23, and therefore denies them.

24. ~~Dish California~~ DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 24, and therefore denies them.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

25. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25, and therefore denies them.

26. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 26, and therefore denies them.

27. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 27, and therefore denies them.

28. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 28, and therefore denies them.

29. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 29, and therefore denies them.

30. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 30, and therefore denies them.

31. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 31, and therefore denies them.

32. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 32, and therefore denies them.

33. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 33, and therefore denies them.

34. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 34, and therefore denies them.

35. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 35, and therefore denies them.

36. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 36, and therefore denies them.

37. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 37, and therefore denies them.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

THE ACCUSED MOCA INSTRUMENTALITIES AND
ACCUSED SERVICES

38. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 38, and therefore denies them.

39. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 39, and therefore denies them.

40. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 40, and therefore denies them.

41. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 41, and therefore denies them.

42. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 42, and therefore denies them.

43. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 43, and therefore denies them.

44. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 44, and therefore denies them.

45. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 45, and therefore denies them.

46. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 46, and therefore denies them.

47. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 47, and therefore denies them.

48. ~~Dish California~~DISH states that the cited video speaks for itself. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 48, and therefore denies them.

49. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 49, and therefore denies them.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

50. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 50, and therefore denies them.

51. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 51, and therefore denies them.

~~52. Denied as to Dish California. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 52, and therefore denies them.~~

~~53. Denied as to Dish California. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 53, and therefore denies them.~~

~~54. Denied as to Dish California. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 54, and therefore denies them.~~

~~52. Denied as to Dish California. Dish California lacks knowledge or~~Denied.

~~55.53.~~ DISH admits that one of its subsidiaries was on the Board of the MoCA Alliance from 2017 to 2019. DISH lacks knowledge of information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations ~~in~~of paragraph ~~5553~~, and therefore denies them.

~~56. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 56, and therefore denies them.~~

~~57. Denied as to Dish California. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 57, and therefore denies them.~~

54. Denied.

55. Denied.

56. Denied.

57. Denied.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

58. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). ~~Dish~~Dish ~~California~~DISH denies all remaining allegations contained in paragraph 58.

59. Dish California admits that it will not contest that venue is proper in this court for purposes of this action, and admits it has transacted business in this District. ~~Dish California~~DISH Colorado denies that venue is proper in this District, and denies that it has transacted business in this District. DISH denies that it has committed any act of patent infringement allegedly described in the Complaint. ~~Dish California and~~otherwise denies all remaining allegations contained in paragraph 59.

~~60.——Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 60, and therefore denies them.~~

~~61.——Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 61, and therefore denies them.~~

60. Dish—CaliforniaDISH admits that *Entropic Comm’s LLC v. DISH Network Corp.*, Case No. 2:22-cv-07959-JWH-(JEMx) was transferred to this Court from the Eastern District of Texas (*Entropic Comm’s, LLC v. DISH Network Corp.*, *DISH Network LLC, DISH Network Service LLC*, Case No. 2:22-cv-00076 JRG on October 24, 2022. DISH denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 60.

61. Paragraph 61 characterizes an order issued by the Eastern District of Texas and contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required, DISH states that the order issued by the Eastern District of Texas speaks for itself. DISH otherwise denies the allegations and characterizations of paragraph 61.

62. DISH admits that it will not contest, for the purposes of this action, that ~~Dish—California~~DISH is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Court. ~~Dish~~Dish ~~California~~DISH denies all remaining allegations contained in paragraph 62.

63. Dish—CaliforniaDenied.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 63.64. DISH admits that it maintains a website that allows consumers to interact
2 with services it provides. DISH otherwise denies the allegations and characterizations
3 of paragraph 6364.

4 64.65. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
5 belief as DISH admits that it provides television and other services to customers in the
6 truth of United States. DISH otherwise denies the allegations in and characterizations
7 of paragraph 64, and therefore denies them.

8 65. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
9 belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 65, and therefore denies them.

10 66. Dish California admits that it provides certain services to customers in
11 this District. As to the remaining allegations in paragraph 66, Dish California lacks
12 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations,
13 and therefore denies them. DISH Colorado denies the allegations of paragraph 66.

14 67. Dish California admits it has facilities at 3226 W. 131st St., Hawthorne,
15 California, 90250; 4223 Fairgrounds Street, Riverside, California 92501; and 2602
16 South Halladay Street, Santa Ana, California. Dish California denies that any
17 activities at these facilities are relevant to the issues in dispute in this case. Dish
18 California denies it has a facility at 1500 Potrero Avenue, South El Monte, California,
19 91733. As to Dish California and DISH Colorado otherwise deny the remaining
20 allegations in and characterizations of paragraph 67, Dish California lacks knowledge
21 or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations, and
22 therefore denies them.

23 68. Dish California DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
24 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 68, and therefore denies them.

25 69. Dish California lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form DISH
26 admits that it maintains a belief as to website, and states that the truth of website speaks
27 for itself. DISH otherwise denies the allegations in and characterizations of paragraph
28 69, and therefore denies them.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ~~70. Dish California denies the allegations of paragraph 70.~~

2 ~~70. Denied.~~

3 71. Dish California admits it conducts business in this District. DISH
4 Colorado denies that it conducts business in this District. To the extent paragraph 71
5 contains additional allegations, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies them.

6 **COUNT I**

7 **([Alleged] Infringement of the '518 Patent)**

8 72. ~~Dish California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to
9 paragraphs 1 through 71 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

10 73. ~~Dish California~~DISH admits that the cover of the '518 Patent reflects an
11 issue date of November 13, 2007, an application date of December 18, 2002, an
12 application filed August 29, 2002, and, *inter alia*, a provisional application filed
13 August 30, 2001. ~~Dish California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations of
14 paragraph 73.

15 74. To the extent paragraph 74 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 74 of the Complaint.

19 75. Paragraph 75 characterizes the subject matter of the '518 Patent and
20 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required,
21 ~~Dish California~~DISH states that the '518 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish~~
22 CaliforniaDISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish California~~DISH implements the
23 features of the '518 Patent. ~~Dish California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations
24 and characterizations of paragraph 75.

25 76. To the extent paragraph 76 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 76 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 77. To the extent paragraph 77 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
3 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 77 of the Complaint.

5 78. To the extent paragraph 78 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
7 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 78 of the Complaint.

9 79. Dish-CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 79.

10 80. To the extent paragraph 80 of the Complaint implicates legal
11 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
12 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
13 80 of the Complaint.

14 81. To the extent paragraph 81 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
16 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 81 of the Complaint.

18 82. To the extent paragraph 82 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
20 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 82 of the Complaint.

22 83. Dish-CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 83.

23 84. Dish-CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
24 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 84, and therefore denies them.

25 85. To the extent paragraph 85 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
27 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 85 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 86. To the extent paragraph 86 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 86 of the Complaint.

5 87. To the extent paragraph 87 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
7 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 87 of the Complaint.

9 88. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that “7295518” appears in Exhibit A to a
10 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 88 of the
11 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
12 response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and
13 characterizations contained in paragraph 88 of the Complaint.

14 89. To the extent paragraph 89 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
16 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 89 of the Complaint.

18 90. To the extent paragraph 90 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
20 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 90 of the Complaint.

22 91. ~~Denied as to Dish—California.~~ ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or
23 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
24 paragraph 91, and therefore denies them.

25 92. To the extent paragraph 92 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 92 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

93. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 93, and therefore denies them.

94. To the extent paragraph 94 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 94 of the Complaint.

95. To the extent paragraph 95 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 95 of the Complaint.

96. To the extent paragraph 96 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 96 of the Complaint.

97. To the extent paragraph 97 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 97 of the Complaint.

98. To the extent paragraph 98 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 98 of the Complaint.

99. To the extent paragraph 99 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 99 of the Complaint.

100. To the extent paragraph 100 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 100 of the Complaint.

3 101. To the extent paragraph 101 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 101 of the Complaint.

7 102. To the extent paragraph 102 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 102 of the Complaint.

11 103. To the extent paragraph 103 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 103 of the Complaint.

15 104. To the extent paragraph 104 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 104 of the Complaint.

19 105. Paragraph 105 of the Complaint characterizes Entropic's belief and thus
20 no response is required. To the extent paragraph 105 of the Complaint implicates
21 legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required,
22 Dish—CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in
23 paragraph 105 of the Complaint.

24 **COUNT II**

25 **([Alleged] Infringement of the '249 Patent)**

26 106. Dish—CaliforniaDISH incorporates by reference its responses to
27 paragraphs 1 through 105 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

107. ~~Dish-California~~DISH admits that the cover of the '249 Patent reflects an issue date of September 22, 2009, an application date of July 21, 2001, and a provisional application date of May 4, 2001. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 107.

108. To the extent paragraph 108 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 108 of the Complaint.

109. Paragraph 109 characterizes the subject matter of the '249 Patent and contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required, ~~Dish-California~~DISH states that the '249 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish-California~~DISH implements the features of the '249 Patent. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations and characterizations of paragraph 109.

110. To the extent paragraph 110 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 110 of the Complaint.

111. To the extent paragraph 111 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 111 of the Complaint.

112. To the extent paragraph 112 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 112 of the Complaint.

113. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations of paragraph 113.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 114. To the extent paragraph 114 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
3 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 114 of the Complaint.

5 115. To the extent paragraph 115 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
7 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 115 of the Complaint.

9 116. To the extent paragraph 116 of the Complaint implicates legal
10 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
11 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
12 116 of the Complaint.

13 117. Dish CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 117.

14 118. Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
15 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 118, and therefore denies them.

16 119. To the extent paragraph 119 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
18 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 119 of the Complaint.

20 120. To the extent paragraph 120 of the Complaint implicates legal
21 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
22 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
23 120 of the Complaint.

24 121. To the extent paragraph 121 of the Complaint implicates legal
25 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
26 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
27 121 of the Complaint.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

122. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that “7594249” appears in Exhibit A to a March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 122 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 122 of the Complaint.

123. To the extent paragraph 123 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 123 of the Complaint.

124. To the extent paragraph 124 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 124 of the Complaint.

125. ~~Denied as to Dish—California.~~ ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of ~~the remaining~~ allegations in paragraph 125, and therefore denies them.

126. To the extent paragraph 126 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 126 of the Complaint.

127. ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 127, and therefore denies them.

128. To the extent paragraph 128 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 128 of the Complaint.

129. To the extent paragraph 129 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 129 of the Complaint.

3 130. To the extent paragraph 130 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 130 of the Complaint.

7 131. To the extent paragraph 131 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 131 of the Complaint.

11 132. To the extent paragraph 132 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 132 of the Complaint.

15 133. To the extent paragraph 133 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 133 of the Complaint.

19 134. To the extent paragraph 134 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 134 of the Complaint.

23 135. To the extent paragraph 135 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 135 of the Complaint.

27 136. To the extent paragraph 136 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 136 of the Complaint.

3 137. To the extent paragraph 137 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 137 of the Complaint.

7 138. To the extent paragraph 138 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 138 of the Complaint.

11 139. Paragraph 139 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
12 required. To the extent paragraph 139 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
13 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 139 of the Complaint.

COUNT III

([Alleged] Infringement of the '759 Patent)

18 140. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH incorporates by reference its responses to
19 paragraphs 1 through 139 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

20 141. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH admits that the cover of the '759 Patent reflects an
21 issue date of February 15, 2011, an application date of July 12, 2004, an application
22 filed August 29, 2002, and, *inter alia* a provisional application filed August 30, 2001.
23 Dish CaliforniaDISH denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 141.

24 142. To the extent paragraph 142 of the Complaint implicates legal
25 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
26 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
27 142 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 143. Paragraph 143 characterizes the subject matter of the '759 Patent and
2 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required,
3 ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '759 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish~~
4 ~~California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish—California~~DISH implements the
5 features of the '759 Patent. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations
6 and characterizations of paragraph 143.

7 144. To the extent paragraph 144 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
9 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 144 of the Complaint.

11 145. To the extent paragraph 145 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
13 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 145 of the Complaint.

15 146. To the extent paragraph 146 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
17 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 146 of the Complaint.

19 147. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations of paragraph 147.

20 148. To the extent paragraph 148 of the Complaint implicates legal
21 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
22 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
23 148 of the Complaint.

24 149. To the extent paragraph 149 of the Complaint implicates legal
25 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
26 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
27 149 of the Complaint.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 150. To the extent paragraph 150 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 150 of the Complaint.

5 151. ~~Dish~~ ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations of paragraph 151.

6 152. ~~Dish~~ ~~California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
7 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 152, and therefore denies them.

8 153. To the extent paragraph 153 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
10 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 153 of the Complaint.

12 154. To the extent paragraph 154 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
14 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 154 of the Complaint.

16 155. To the extent paragraph 155 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
18 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 155 of the Complaint.

20 156. ~~Dish~~ ~~California~~DISH admits that “7889759” appears in Exhibit A to a
21 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 156 of the
22 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
23 response is required, ~~Dish~~ ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and
24 characterizations contained in paragraph 156 of the Complaint.

25 157. To the extent paragraph 157 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 157 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 158. To the extent paragraph 158 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 158 of the Complaint.

5 159. ~~Denied as to Dish California.~~ ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or
6 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
7 paragraph 159, and therefore denies them.

8 160. To the extent paragraph 160 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
10 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 160 of the Complaint.

12 161. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
13 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 161, and therefore denies them.

14 162. To the extent paragraph 162 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
16 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 162 of the Complaint.

18 163. To the extent paragraph 163 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
20 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 163 of the Complaint.

22 164. To the extent paragraph 164 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
24 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 164 of the Complaint.

26 165. To the extent paragraph 165 of the Complaint implicates legal
27 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 165 of the Complaint.

3 166. To the extent paragraph 166 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 166 of the Complaint.

7 167. To the extent paragraph 167 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 167 of the Complaint.

11 168. To the extent paragraph 168 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 168 of the Complaint.

15 169. To the extent paragraph 169 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 169 of the Complaint.

19 170. To the extent paragraph 170 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 170 of the Complaint.

23 171. To the extent paragraph 171 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 171 of the Complaint.

27 172. To the extent paragraph 172 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 172 of the Complaint.

3 173. Paragraph 173 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
4 required. To the extent paragraph 173 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
5 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
6 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
7 173 of the Complaint.

8 **COUNT IV**

9 **([Alleged] Infringement of the '802 Patent)**

10 174. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to
11 paragraphs 1 through 173 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

12 175. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits the cover of the '802 Patent reflects an issue
13 date of December 27, 2011, an application date of December 2, 2005, and a
14 provisional application filed on December 2, 2004. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any
15 remaining allegations of paragraph 175.

16 176. To the extent paragraph 176 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
18 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 176 of the Complaint.

20 177. Paragraph 177 characterizes the subject matter of the '802 Patent and
21 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required,
22 ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '802 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish~~
23 ~~California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish—California~~DISH implements the
24 features of the '802 Patent. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations
25 and characterizations of paragraph 177.

26 178. To the extent paragraph 178 of the Complaint implicates legal
27 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 178 of the Complaint.

3 179. To the extent paragraph 179 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 179 of the Complaint.

7 180. To the extent paragraph 180 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 180 of the Complaint.

11 181. Dish-CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 181.

12 182. To the extent paragraph 182 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 182 of the Complaint.

16 183. To the extent paragraph 183 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
18 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 183 of the Complaint.

20 184. To the extent paragraph 184 of the Complaint implicates legal
21 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
22 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
23 184 of the Complaint.

24 185. Dish-CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 185.

25 186. To the extent paragraph 186 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
27 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 186 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 187. To the extent paragraph 187 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 187 of the Complaint.

5 188. To the extent paragraph 188 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
7 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 188 of the Complaint.

9 189. To the extent paragraph 189 of the Complaint implicates legal
10 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
11 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
12 189 of the Complaint.

13 190. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that “8085802” appears in Exhibit A to a
14 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 190 of the
15 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
16 response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and
17 characterizations contained in paragraph 190 of the Complaint.

18 191. To the extent paragraph 191 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
20 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 191 of the Complaint.

22 192. To the extent paragraph 192 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
24 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 192 of the Complaint.

26 193. ~~Denied as to Dish—California.~~ ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or
27 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
28 paragraph 193, and therefore denies them.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 194. To the extent paragraph 194 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
3 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 194 of the Complaint.

5 195. Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
6 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 195, and therefore denies them.

7 196. To the extent paragraph 196 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 196 of the Complaint.

11 197. To the extent paragraph 197 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 197 of the Complaint.

15 198. To the extent paragraph 198 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 198 of the Complaint.

19 199. To the extent paragraph 199 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 199 of the Complaint.

23 200. To the extent paragraph 200 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 200 of the Complaint.

27 201. To the extent paragraph 201 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 201 of the Complaint.

3 202. To the extent paragraph 202 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 202 of the Complaint.

7 203. To the extent paragraph 203 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 203 of the Complaint.

11 204. To the extent paragraph 204 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 204 of the Complaint.

15 205. To the extent paragraph 205 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 205 of the Complaint.

19 206. To the extent paragraph 206 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 206 of the Complaint.

23 207. Paragraph 207 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
24 required. To the extent paragraph 207 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
25 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
26 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
27 207 of the Complaint.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

COUNT V

([Alleged] Infringement of the '450 Patent)

208. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1 through 207 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

209. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that the cover of the '450 Patent reflects an issue date of January 14, 2014, an application date of September 19, 2005, and, *inter alia*, a provisional application filed December 2, 2004. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 209.

210. To the extent paragraph 210 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 210 of the Complaint.

211. Paragraph 211 characterizes the subject matter of the '450 patent and contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '450 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish—California~~DISH implements the features of the '450 Patent. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations and characterizations of paragraph 211.

212. To the extent paragraph 212 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 212 of the Complaint.

213. To the extent paragraph 213 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 213 of the Complaint.

214. To the extent paragraph 214 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 214 of the Complaint.

3 215. Dish-CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 215.

4 216. To the extent paragraph 216 of the Complaint implicates legal
5 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
6 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
7 216 of the Complaint.

8 217. To the extent paragraph 217 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
10 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 217 of the Complaint.

12 218. To the extent paragraph 218 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 218 of the Complaint.

16 219. Dish-CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 219.

17 220. Dish-CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
18 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 220, and therefore denies them.

19 221. To the extent paragraph 221 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 221 of the Complaint.

23 222. To the extent paragraph 222 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 222 of the Complaint.

27 223. To the extent paragraph 223 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 223 of the Complaint.

3 224. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that “8631450” appears in Exhibit A to a
4 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 224 of the
5 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
6 response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and
7 characterizations contained in paragraph 224 of the Complaint.

8 225. To the extent paragraph 225 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
10 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 225 of the Complaint.

12 226. To the extent paragraph 226 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 226 of the Complaint.

16 227. ~~Denied as to Dish—California.~~ ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or
17 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
18 paragraph 227, and therefore denies them.

19 228. To the extent paragraph 228 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 228 of the Complaint.

23 229. ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
24 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 229, and therefore denies them.

25 230. To the extent paragraph 230 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 230 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

231. To the extent paragraph 231 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 231 of the Complaint.

232. To the extent paragraph 232 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 232 of the Complaint.

233. To the extent paragraph 233 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 233 of the Complaint.

234. To the extent paragraph 234 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 234 of the Complaint.

235. To the extent paragraph 235 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 235 of the Complaint.

236. To the extent paragraph 236 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 236 of the Complaint.

237. To the extent paragraph 237 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 237 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

238. To the extent paragraph 238 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish CaliforniaDISH](#) denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 238 of the Complaint.

239. To the extent paragraph 239 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish CaliforniaDISH](#) denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 239 of the Complaint.

240. To the extent paragraph 240 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish CaliforniaDISH](#) denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 240 of the Complaint.

241. Paragraph 241 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is required. To the extent paragraph 241 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish CaliforniaDISH](#) denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 241 of the Complaint.

COUNT VI

([Alleged] Infringement of the '7,566 Patent)

242. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

243. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

244. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

245. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 246. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
2 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

3 247. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
4 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

5 248. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
6 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

7 249. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
8 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

9 250. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
10 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

11 251. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
12 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

13 252. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
14 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

15 253. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
16 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

17 254. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
18 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

19 255. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
20 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

21 256. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
22 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

23 257. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
24 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

25 258. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
26 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

27 259. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
28 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 260. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
2 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

3 261. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
4 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

5 262. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
6 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

7 263. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
8 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

9 264. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
10 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

11 265. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
12 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

13 266. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
14 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

15 267. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
16 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

17 268. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
18 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

19 269. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
20 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

21 270. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
22 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

23 271. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
24 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

25 272. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
26 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

27 273. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its
28 September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

274. The Court dismissed Count VI without leave to amend in its September 7, 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

COUNT VII

276. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1 through 275 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

278. To the extent paragraph 278 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish CaliforniaDISH](#) denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 278 of the Complaint.

279. Paragraph 279 characterizes the subject matter of the '539 Patent and contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '539 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish—California~~DISH implements the features of the '539 Patent. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations and characterizations of Paragraph 279.

280. To the extent paragraph 280 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish CaliforniaDISH](#) denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 280 of the Complaint.

281. To the extent paragraph 281 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, [Dish](#)

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 281 of the Complaint.

3 282. To the extent paragraph 282 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 282 of the Complaint.

7 283. Dish CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 283.

8 284. To the extent paragraph 284 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
10 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 284 of the Complaint.

12 285. To the extent paragraph 285 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 285 of the Complaint.

16 286. To the extent paragraph 286 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
18 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 286 of the Complaint.

20 287. Dish CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 287.

21 288. Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
22 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 288, and therefore denies them.

23 289. To the extent paragraph 289 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 289 of the Complaint.

27 290. To the extent paragraph 290 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 290 of the Complaint.

3 291. To the extent paragraph 291 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 291 of the Complaint.

7 292. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH admits that “8621539” appears in Exhibit A to a
8 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 292 of the
9 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
10 response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and
11 characterizations contained in paragraph 292 of the Complaint.

12 293. To the extent paragraph 293 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 293 of the Complaint.

16 294. To the extent paragraph 294 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
18 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 294 of the Complaint.

20 295. ~~Denied as to Dish-California.~~ Dish-CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or
21 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in
22 paragraph 295, and therefore denies them.

23 296. To the extent paragraph 296 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 296 of the Complaint.

27 297. ~~Dish-CaliforniaDISH~~ lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
28 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 297, and therefore denies them.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

298. To the extent paragraph 298 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 298 of the Complaint.

299. To the extent paragraph 299 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 299 of the Complaint.

300. To the extent paragraph 300 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 300 of the Complaint.

301. To the extent paragraph 301 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 301 of the Complaint.

302. To the extent paragraph 302 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 302 of the Complaint.

303. To the extent paragraph 303 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 303 of the Complaint.

304. To the extent paragraph 304 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 304 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 305. To the extent paragraph 305 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 305 of the Complaint.

5 306. To the extent paragraph 306 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
7 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 306 of the Complaint.

9 307. To the extent paragraph 307 of the Complaint implicates legal
10 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
11 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
12 307 of the Complaint.

13 308. To the extent paragraph 308 of the Complaint implicates legal
14 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
15 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
16 308 of the Complaint.

17 309. Paragraph 309 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
18 required. To the extent paragraph 309 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
19 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
20 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 309 of the Complaint.

COUNT VIII

([Alleged] Infringement of the '213 Patent)

24 310. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to
25 paragraphs 1 through 309 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

26 311. ~~Dish~~CaliforniaDISH admits the cover of the '213 Patent reflects an issue
27 date of December 5, 2017, an application date of February 6, 2008, and *inter alia*, a
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 provisional application filed on February 6, 2007. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any
2 remaining allegations of paragraph 311.

3 312. To the extent paragraph 312 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
5 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 312 of the Complaint.

7 313. Paragraph 313 characterizes the subject matter of the '213 Patent and
8 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required,
9 ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '213 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish~~
10 ~~California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish—California~~DISH implements the
11 features of the '213 Patent. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations
12 and characterizations of paragraph 313.

13 314. To the extent paragraph 314 of the Complaint implicates legal
14 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
15 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
16 314 of the Complaint.

17 315. To the extent paragraph 315 of the Complaint implicates legal
18 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
19 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
20 315 of the Complaint.

21 316. To the extent paragraph 316 of the Complaint implicates legal
22 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
23 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
24 316 of the Complaint.

25 317. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations of paragraph 317.

26 318. To the extent paragraph 318 of the Complaint implicates legal
27 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 318 of the Complaint.

3 319. To the extent paragraph 319 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 319 of the Complaint.

7 320. To the extent paragraph 320 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 320 of the Complaint.

11 321. Dish-CalendarDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 321.

12 322. Dish-CalendarDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
13 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 322, and therefore denies them.

14 323. To the extent paragraph 323 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
16 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 323 of the Complaint.

18 324. To the extent paragraph 324 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
20 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 324 of the Complaint.

22 325. To the extent paragraph 325 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
24 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 325 of the Complaint.

26 326. Dish-CalendarDISH admits that “9838213” appears in Exhibit A to a
27 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 326 of the
28 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies the allegations and
2 characterizations contained in paragraph 326 of the Complaint.

3 327. To the extent paragraph 327 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
5 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 327 of the Complaint.

7 328. To the extent paragraph 328 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
9 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 328 of the Complaint.

11 329. ~~Denied as to Dish—California.~~ ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or
12 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
13 paragraph 329, and therefore denies them.

14 330. To the extent paragraph 330 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
16 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 330 of the Complaint.

18 331. ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
19 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 331, and therefore denies them.

20 332. To the extent paragraph 332 of the Complaint implicates legal
21 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
22 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
23 332 of the Complaint.

24 333. To the extent paragraph 333 of the Complaint implicates legal
25 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
26 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
27 333 of the Complaint.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

334. To the extent paragraph 334 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 334 of the Complaint.

335. To the extent paragraph 335 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 335 of the Complaint.

336. To the extent paragraph 336 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 336 of the Complaint.

337. To the extent paragraph 337 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 337 of the Complaint.

338. To the extent paragraph 338 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 338 of the Complaint.

339. To the extent paragraph 339 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 339 of the Complaint.

340. To the extent paragraph 340 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~DISH~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 340 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 341. To the extent paragraph 341 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 341 of the Complaint.

5 342. To the extent paragraph 342 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
7 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 342 of the Complaint.

9 343. Paragraph 343 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
10 required. To the extent paragraph 343 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
11 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
12 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
13 343 of the Complaint.

COUNT IX

([Alleged] Infringement of the '422 Patent)

14
15
16 344. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to
17 paragraphs 1 through 343 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

18 345. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits the cover of the '422 Patent reflects an issue
19 date of October 1, 2019, an application date of December 5, 2017, an application filed
20 on February 6, 2008, and *inter alia*, a provisional application filed on February 6,
21 2007. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 345.

22 346. To the extent paragraph 346 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
24 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 346 of the Complaint.

26 347. Paragraph 347 characterizes the subject matter of the '422 Patent and
27 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required,
28 ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '422 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish-CaliforniaDISH~~ implements the
2 features of the '422 Patent. ~~Dish-CaliforniaDISH~~ denies any remaining allegations
3 and characterizations of paragraph 347.

4 348. To the extent paragraph 348 of the Complaint implicates legal
5 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
6 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
7 348 of the Complaint.

8 349. To the extent paragraph 349 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
10 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 349 of the Complaint.

12 350. To the extent paragraph 350 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 350 of the Complaint.

16 351. ~~Dish-CaliforniaDISH~~ denies the allegations of paragraph 351.

17 352. To the extent paragraph 352 of the Complaint implicates legal
18 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
19 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
20 352 of the Complaint.

21 353. To the extent paragraph 353 of the Complaint implicates legal
22 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
23 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
24 353 of the Complaint.

25 354. To the extent paragraph 354 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 354 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 355. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 355.

2 356. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
3 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 356, and therefore denies them.

4 357. To the extent paragraph 357 of the Complaint implicates legal
5 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
6 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
7 357 of the Complaint.

8 358. To the extent paragraph 358 of the Complaint implicates legal
9 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
10 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
11 358 of the Complaint.

12 359. To the extent paragraph 359 of the Complaint implicates legal
13 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
14 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
15 359 of the Complaint.

16 360. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH admits that “10432422” appears in Exhibit A to a
17 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 360 of the
18 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
19 response is required, ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and
20 characterizations contained in paragraph 360 of the Complaint.

21 361. To the extent paragraph 361 of the Complaint implicates legal
22 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
23 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
24 361 of the Complaint.

25 362. To the extent paragraph 362 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 362 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 363. ~~Denied as to Dish California.~~ Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or
2 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
3 paragraph 363, and therefore denies them.

4 364. To the extent paragraph 364 of the Complaint implicates legal
5 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
6 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
7 364 of the Complaint.

8 365. Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
9 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 365, and therefore denies them.

10 366. To the extent paragraph 366 of the Complaint implicates legal
11 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
12 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
13 366 of the Complaint.

14 367. To the extent paragraph 367 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
16 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 367 of the Complaint.

18 368. To the extent paragraph 368 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
20 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 368 of the Complaint.

22 369. To the extent paragraph 369 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
24 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 369 of the Complaint.

26 370. To the extent paragraph 370 of the Complaint implicates legal
27 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 370 of the Complaint.

3 371. To the extent paragraph 371 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 371 of the Complaint.

7 372. To the extent paragraph 372 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 372 of the Complaint.

11 373. To the extent paragraph 373 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 373 of the Complaint.

15 374. To the extent paragraph 374 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 374 of the Complaint.

19 375. To the extent paragraph 375 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 375 of the Complaint.

23 376. To the extent paragraph 376 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 376 of the Complaint.

27 377. Paragraph 377 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
28 required. To the extent paragraph 377 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
377 of the Complaint.

COUNT X

([Alleged] Infringement of the '910 Patent)

378. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

379. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

380. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

381. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

382. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

383. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

384. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

385. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

386. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

387. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

388. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 389. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

3 390. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
4 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

5 391. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
6 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

7 392. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
8 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

9 393. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
10 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

11 394. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
12 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

13 395. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
14 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

15 396. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
16 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

17 397. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
18 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

19 398. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
20 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

21 399. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
22 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

23 400. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
24 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

25 401. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
26 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

27 402. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
28 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 403. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
2 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

3 404. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
4 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

5 405. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
6 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

7 406. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
8 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

9 407. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
10 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

11 408. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
12 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

13 409. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
14 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

15 410. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
16 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

17 411. The Court dismissed Count X without leave to amend in its September 7,
18 2023 Order (Dkt. 103) and therefore, no response is required.

19 **COUNT XI**

20 **([Alleged] Infringement of the '0,566 Patent)**

21 412. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to
22 paragraphs 1 through 411 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

23 413. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that the cover of the '0,566 Patent reflects
24 an issue date of November 27, 2012, an application date of October 15, 2009, and,
25 *inter alia*, a provisional application filed October 16, 2008. ~~Dish—California~~DISH
26 denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 413.

27 414. To the extent paragraph 414 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 414 of the Complaint.

3 415. Paragraph 415 characterizes the subject matter of the '0,566 Patent and
4 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a response is required,
5 ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH states that the '0,566 Patent speaks for itself. ~~Dish~~
6 CaliforniaDISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH implements the
7 features of the '0,566 Patent. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies any remaining allegations
8 and characterizations of paragraph 415.

9 416. To the extent paragraph 416 of the Complaint implicates legal
10 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
11 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
12 416 of the Complaint.

13 417. To the extent paragraph 417 of the Complaint implicates legal
14 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
15 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
16 417 of the Complaint.

17 418. To the extent paragraph 418 of the Complaint implicates legal
18 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
19 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
20 418 of the Complaint.

21 419. ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 419.

22 420. To the extent paragraph 420 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
24 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 420 of the Complaint.

26 421. To the extent paragraph 421 of the Complaint implicates legal
27 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 421 of the Complaint.

3 422. To the extent paragraph 422 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 422 of the Complaint.

7 423. Dish CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations of paragraph 423.

8 424. Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
9 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 424, and therefore denies them.

10 425. To the extent paragraph 425 of the Complaint implicates legal
11 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
12 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
13 425 of the Complaint.

14 426. To the extent paragraph 426 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
16 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 426 of the Complaint.

18 427. To the extent paragraph 427 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
20 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 427 of the Complaint.

22 428. Dish CaliforniaDISH admits that “8320566” appears in Exhibit A to a
23 March 9, 2022 communication from Entropic. To the extent paragraph 428 of the
24 Complaint implicates legal conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a
25 response is required, Dish—CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and
26 characterizations contained in paragraph 428 of the Complaint.

27 429. To the extent paragraph 429 of the Complaint implicates legal
28 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 429 of the Complaint.

3 430. To the extent paragraph 430 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 430 of the Complaint.

7 431. ~~Dish CaliforniaDISH~~ lacks knowledge or
8 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
9 paragraph 431, and therefore denies them.

10 432. To the extent paragraph 432 of the Complaint implicates legal
11 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
12 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
13 432 of the Complaint.

14 433. ~~Dish CaliforniaDISH~~ lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
15 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 433, and therefore denies them.

16 434. To the extent paragraph 434 of the Complaint implicates legal
17 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
18 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
19 434 of the Complaint.

20 435. To the extent paragraph 435 of the Complaint implicates legal
21 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
22 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
23 435 of the Complaint.

24 436. To the extent paragraph 436 of the Complaint implicates legal
25 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
26 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
27 436 of the Complaint.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 437. To the extent paragraph 437 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 437 of the Complaint.

5 438. To the extent paragraph 438 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
7 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 438 of the Complaint.

9 439. To the extent paragraph 439 of the Complaint implicates legal
10 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
11 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
12 439 of the Complaint.

13 440. To the extent paragraph 440 of the Complaint implicates legal
14 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
15 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
16 440 of the Complaint.

17 441. To the extent paragraph 441 of the Complaint implicates legal
18 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
19 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
20 441 of the Complaint.

21 442. To the extent paragraph 442 of the Complaint implicates legal
22 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
23 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
24 442 of the Complaint.

25 443. To the extent paragraph 443 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 443 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 444. To the extent paragraph 444 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 444 of the Complaint.

5 445. Paragraph 445 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
6 required. To the extent paragraph 445 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
7 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
8 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
9 445 of the Complaint.

COUNT XII

11 ([Alleged] Infringement of the '681 Patent)

12 446. ~~Dish—California~~DISH incorporates by reference its responses to
13 paragraphs 1 through 445 of the Complaint as though fully restated herein.

14 447. ~~Dish—California~~DISH admits that the cover of the '681 Patent reflects an
15 issue date of January 29, 2013, an application date of October 15, 2009, and a
16 provisional application date of October 16, 2008. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any
17 remaining allegations of paragraph 447 of the Complaint.

18 448. To the extent paragraph 448 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
20 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 448 of the Complaint.

22 449. Paragraph 449 of the Complaint characterizes the subject matter of the
23 '681 Patent and contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. If a
24 response is required, ~~Dish—California~~DISH states that the '681 Patent speaks for itself.
25 ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies all allegations that ~~Dish—California~~DISH implements the
26 features of the '681 Patent. ~~Dish—California~~DISH denies any remaining allegations
27 and characterizations of paragraph 449 of the Complaint.
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 450. To the extent paragraph 450 of the Complaint implicates legal
2 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
3 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
4 450 of the Complaint.

5 451. To the extent paragraph 451 of the Complaint implicates legal
6 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
7 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
8 451 of the Complaint.

9 452. To the extent paragraph 452 of the Complaint implicates legal
10 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
11 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
12 452 of the Complaint.

13 453. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations of paragraph 453 of the
14 Complaint.

15 454. To the extent paragraph 454 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
17 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 454 of the Complaint.

19 455. To the extent paragraph 455 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
21 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 455 of the Complaint.

23 456. To the extent paragraph 456 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
25 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 456 of the Complaint.

27 457. ~~Dish-California~~DISH denies the allegations of paragraph 457 of the
28 Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 458. ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
2 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 458, and therefore denies them.

3 459. To the extent paragraph 459 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
5 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 459 of the Complaint.

7 460. To the extent paragraph 460 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
9 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 460 of the Complaint.

11 461. To the extent paragraph 461 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
13 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 461 of the Complaint.

15 462. ~~Dish California~~DISH admits that “8363681” appears in Exhibit A to a
16 March 9, 2022 communication—but not an August 9, 2022 communication—from
17 Entropic. To the extent paragraph 462 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,
18 no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
19 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
20 462 of the Complaint.

21 463. To the extent paragraph 463 of the Complaint implicates legal
22 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
23 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
24 463 of the Complaint.

25 464. To the extent paragraph 464 of the Complaint implicates legal
26 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish~~
27 ~~California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
28 464 of the Complaint.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 465. ~~Denied as to Dish California.~~ Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or
2 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the ~~remaining~~ allegations in
3 paragraph 465 of the Complaint, and therefore denies them.

4 466. To the extent paragraph 466 of the Complaint implicates legal
5 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
6 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
7 466 of the Complaint.

8 467. Dish CaliforniaDISH lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form
9 a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 467, and therefore denies them.

10 468. To the extent paragraph 468 of the Complaint implicates legal
11 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
12 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
13 468 of the Complaint.

14 469. To the extent paragraph 469 of the Complaint implicates legal
15 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
16 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
17 469 of the Complaint.

18 470. To the extent paragraph 470 of the Complaint implicates legal
19 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
20 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
21 470 of the Complaint.

22 471. To the extent paragraph 471 of the Complaint implicates legal
23 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
24 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
25 471 of the Complaint.

26 472. To the extent paragraph 472 of the Complaint implicates legal
27 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
2 472 of the Complaint.

3 473. To the extent paragraph 473 of the Complaint implicates legal
4 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
5 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
6 473 of the Complaint.

7 474. To the extent paragraph 474 of the Complaint implicates legal
8 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
9 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
10 474 of the Complaint.

11 475. To the extent paragraph 475 of the Complaint implicates legal
12 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
13 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
14 475 of the Complaint.

15 476. To the extent paragraph 476 of the Complaint implicates legal
16 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
17 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
18 476 of the Complaint.

19 477. To the extent paragraph 477 of the Complaint implicates legal
20 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
21 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
22 477 of the Complaint.

23 478. To the extent paragraph 478 of the Complaint implicates legal
24 conclusions, no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Dish
25 CaliforniaDISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph
26 478 of the Complaint.

27 479. Paragraph 479 characterizes Entropic's belief and thus no response is
28 required. To the extent paragraph 479 of the Complaint implicates legal conclusions,

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, ~~Dish California~~DISH denies the allegations and characterizations contained in paragraph 479 of the Complaint.

JURY DEMAND

~~Dish California~~DISH hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable by right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The section of the Complaint titled “Prayer for Relief” sets forth the statement of relief requested by Entropic to which no response is required. ~~Dish California~~DISH denies that Entropic is entitled to any relief sought in its Prayer for Relief or otherwise.

AFFIRMATIVE AND ADDITIONAL DEFENSES

480. ~~Dish California~~DISH incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs in their entirety and asserts the following affirmative and additional defenses. By asserting these affirmative and additional defenses, ~~Dish California~~DISH does not admit that it bears the burden of proof on any issue and does not accept any burden it would not otherwise bear. ~~Dish California~~DISH reserves all affirmative defenses permitted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Patent Laws of the United States and/or at law or in equity that may now exist, or in the future be available, based on discovery and further investigation in this case, as well as the right to amend this Answer to include those defenses. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(c), ~~Dish California~~DISH, without waiver, limitation, or prejudice, hereby asserts the following affirmative and additional defenses.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(Limitation on Damages/Failure to Mark)

481. Entropic’s request for “damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate Entropic for [~~Dish California’s~~DISH’s] past . . . infringement” for the period before Entropic filed the Complaint or allegedly notified ~~Dish California~~DISH of Entropic’s allegations of infringement of the Asserted Patents before March 9,

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

2022, are barred by 35 U.S.C. § 286. The relief sought by Entropic based on ~~Dish~~
~~California's~~DISH's alleged infringement of the Asserted Patents is further limited by
35 U.S.C. § 287 to the extent Entropic, any predecessors-in-interest, or its licensees
failed to mark allegedly practicing products.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(License and Waiver)

482. Although ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information
sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of Entropic's admission that the Asserted
Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard,
if true, Entropic's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by actual license, the doctrine
of implied license, and/or waiver. These licenses include, but are not limited to,
express or implied licenses arising from Entropic Communications, Inc.'s and/or
MaxLinear's participation in the Multimedia over Coax Alliance ("MoCA"), as well
as the MoCA "Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Policy" (hereinafter, the "MoCA
IPR Policy").

483. Although ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information
sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of Entropic's admission that the Asserted
Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard,
if true, Entropic's claims are further barred, in whole or in part, based on its waiver
of it claims. ~~Dish—California~~DISH reasonably relied on Entropic's and its
predecessors-in-interest, Entropic Communications, Inc.'s and MaxLinear's, conduct
in various MoCA meetings indicating that Entropic Communications, Inc. or
MaxLinear would not enforce patents that cover functionality and features that it had
publicly disclosed in various MoCA proposals.

484. ~~Dish—California~~DISH reasonably relied on its knowledge of Entropic
Communications, Inc.'s and MaxLinear's MoCA proposals, and Entropic
Communications, Inc.'s and MaxLinear's active and public endorsement of its MoCA
proposals to reasonably infer that alleged rights that covered such similar technology,

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 features, and functionality as those that were publicly disclosed in the MoCA
2 proposals, would not be enforced against ~~Dish California~~DISH.

3 485. Although Entropic Communications, Inc. publicly disclosed the features
4 and functionality of the MoCA proposals, Entropic, Entropic Communications, Inc.
5 and MaxLinear did not seek to enforce patents covering the same features and
6 functionality for nearly two decades. Consequently, ~~Dish California~~DISH is licensed
7 and impliedly licensed to the Asserted Patents, and the allegations against ~~Dish~~
8 ~~California~~DISH are waived.

9 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE**

10 **(Equitable Estoppel)**

11 486. Although ~~Dish California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information
12 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of Entropic's admission that the Asserted
13 Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard,
14 if true, Entropic's claims are also barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of
15 equitable estoppel at least because ~~Dish California~~DISH reasonably relied on Entropic
16 or its predecessors-in-interests' conduct as a Founder, Adopter, and Supplier of
17 MoCA technology as well as Entropic's predecessors-in-interests' participation in
18 MoCA.

19 487. As a Founder of MoCA, Entropic Communications, Inc. helped develop
20 the MoCA specifications that required Adopters of MoCA to comply with the
21 specification. Entropic, Entropic Communications, Inc., and MaxLinear did not seek
22 a license from ~~Dish California~~DISH for the use of any patents it considered essential
23 to MoCA before filing this litigation.

24 488. ~~Dish California's~~DISH's affiliates participated in MoCA with the
25 understanding the Entropic Communications, Inc. and any future affiliates including
26 Entropic would license any of its patents related to MoCA to other parties to
27 manufacture components implementing MoCA.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 489. Based on this conduct, it was reasonable for ~~Dish-California~~DISH to
2 believe that Entropic would not enforce the Asserted Patents against the MoCA
3 specification that Entropic Communications, Inc. and MaxLinear helped develop and
4 encouraged MoCA members to adopt in their roles as a Founder and member.

5 490. ~~Dish-California~~DISH and its customers would be materially prejudiced
6 if Entropic were allowed to proceed with its infringement claims for the Asserted
7 Patents.

8 491. Entropic is estopped from asserting one or more of the Asserted Patents
9 because it has failed to comply with commitments made by Entropic and/or its
10 predecessors-in-interest, to MoCA to license one or more of the Asserted Patents
11 under fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (“RAND”) terms if Entropic’s
12 admission that the Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one
13 version of the MoCA standard is true.

14 492. Additionally, Entropic is estopped from seeking damages in an amount
15 that exceeds a royalty rate that is consistent with commitments to license such patents
16 under RAND terms if Entropic’s admission that the Asserted Patents are standard
17 essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard is true.

18 493. Entropic is estopped from seeking damages in this case exceeding the
19 rate at which one or more of the Asserted Patents have been licensed to any other
20 companies due to commitments made by Entropic and/or its predecessors-in-interest
21 to MoCA to license one or more of the Asserted Patents under RAND terms during
22 the MoCA’s consideration of the MoCA specifications at issue if Entropic’s
23 admission that the Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one
24 version of the MoCA standard is true.

25 494. Further, Entropic is estopped from enforcing the Asserted Patents and
26 seeking damages in this case in light of the conduct described above including the
27 lack of notice from Entropic and/or its predecessors-in-interest regarding any need
28 license the Asserted Patents until the filing of the Complaint or the March, 2022 letter,

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ~~Dish California's~~DISH's detrimental reliance on that conduct, and the damages ~~Dish~~
2 ~~California~~DISH has suffered through this litigation.

3 **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE**

4 **(Limitation on Damages Based on RAND Obligations)**

5 495. Although ~~Dish—California~~DISH lacks knowledge or information
6 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of Entropic's admission that the Asserted
7 Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard,
8 if true, Entropic and/or its predecessors-in-interest has undertaken, in accordance with
9 the relevant rules and intellectual property rights policies of applicable Standard
10 Setting Organizations ("SSOs"), to grant licenses to some entities under each of the
11 Asserted Patents on RAND terms and conditions. Entropic has not, however, offered
12 ~~Dish California~~DISH fair, reasonable and nondiscriminatory royalty terms and rates
13 that are proportionate to royalty terms and rates offered to other companies. As a
14 beneficiary of the rules and intellectual property rights policies of the relevant SSOs
15 (i.e., MoCA), ~~Dish—California~~DISH has the right to be granted license(s) to the
16 Asserted Patents on RAND terms and conditions if Entropic's admission that the
17 Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA
18 standard is true. Entropic has failed to offer such a license. Entropic's failure to
19 comply with its RAND obligations limits the damages, if any, available to Entropic
20 in this action.

21 **FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE**

22 **(No Entitlement to Enhanced Damages)**

23 496. Entropic is not entitled to enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 or
24 pursuant to the Court's inherent powers.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(No Entitlement to Attorneys' Fees)

497. Entropic is not entitled to attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 or pursuant to the Court's inherent powers.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(No Entitlement to a Finding of Exceptional Case)

498. Entropic is not entitled to a finding that this case is exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 or under the Court's inherent powers.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(Unenforceability)

499. One or more of the Asserted Patents are unenforceable against ~~Dish~~ CaliforniaDISH because of estoppel, laches, waiver, unclean hands, patent exhaustion, implied license, and/or other equitable doctrines. Entropic and/or its predecessors-in-interest has engaged in standards-setting misconduct, including without limitation the breach of its commitments to license any essential patents on RAND terms rendering the Asserted Patents unenforceable if Entropic's admission that the Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard is true.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(Patent Exhaustion)

500. Entropic's claims are barred, in whole or in part, to the extent that any allegedly infringing products or components thereof are supplied, directly or indirectly, to ~~Dish-California~~ DISH by any entity or entities having an express or implied license to the Asserted Patents, and/or Entropic's claims are barred, in whole or in part, under the doctrine of patent exhaustion. In this regard, to the extent that any of Entropic's accusations of infringement are based, in whole or in part, on

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

Entropic Communications Inc. or MaxLinear components, such claims are barred and exhausted.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(Noninfringement of the Asserted Patents)

501. ~~Dish California~~DISH has not infringed and does not infringe, under any theory of infringement (including directly (whether individually or jointly) or indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement) or under the doctrine of equivalents), any valid, enforceable claim of the Asserted Patents.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(Invalidity of the Asserted Patents)

502. Each asserted claim of the Asserted Patents is invalid for failure to comply with one or more of the requirements of the United States Code, Title 35, including without limitation, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112, and the rules, regulations, and laws pertaining thereto, and/or under other judicially created bases for invalidity and ineligibility, including, but not limited to, the non-statutory doctrine of double patenting, derivation and improper inventorship.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE OR ADDITIONAL DEFENSE

(Lack of Knowledge)

503. To the extent that Entropic asserts that ~~Dish California~~DISH indirectly infringes, either by contributory infringement or inducement of infringement, ~~Dish California~~DISH is not liable to Entropic for the acts alleged to have been performed before ~~Dish California~~DISH knew that its actions would cause indirect infringement.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Standing)

504. As discussed more fully below in the counterclaims asserted by DISH, the assignment of the Asserted Patents to Entropic is defective. Entropic therefore lacks standing to assert infringement of the Asserted Patents.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Patent Misuse)

505. As discussed more fully below in the counterclaims asserted by DISH, Entropic has engaged in patent misuse, rendering the asserted patents unenforceable.

RESERVATION OF ALL AFFIRMATIVE AND ADDITIONAL DEFENSES

504.506. ~~Dish California~~ DISH hereby gives notice that it intends to rely upon any other matter constituting an avoidance or affirmative defense as set forth in Rule 8(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and that it reserves the right to seek leave to amend this Answer to add to, amend, withdraw, or modify these defenses as its investigation continues and as discovery may require.

JURY DEMAND

505.507. ~~Dish California~~ DISH respectfully demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable in this matter.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

COUNTERCLAIMS

~~506. Counterclaimant~~ In accordance with Rules 15 and 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendants-Counterclaimants DISH Network Corporation; DISH Network L.L.C.; Dish Network Service L.L.C., and Dish Network California Service Corp. (“Defendant” or “Dish California” collectively the “DISH Defendants”); together with Counterclaim-Plaintiff DISH Technologies L.L.C. (“DISH Technologies”)³ (together with the DISH Defendants, “DISH”), through its~~their~~ undersigned counsel, counterclaims and alleges against Plaintiff-Counter Defendant Entropic and Communications, LLC (“Entropic”); and against Counter Defendants MaxLinear, Inc. and MaxLinear Communications LLC (collectively “MaxLinear”) as follows:

NATURE OF THE COUNTERCLAIMS

~~507.1. Dish—California~~ DISH brings these counterclaims in response to Entropic’s conduct in connection with filing and pursuing the present action and for Entropic and/or its predecessors-in-~~interests’~~ interest’s breaches of their commitments to ~~an industry alliance~~ a standards-setting organization known as the Multimedia over Coax Alliance (or “MoCA”), ~~and~~ its members, and those who choose to implement MoCA standards. As to MaxLinear, DISH brings these counterclaims in response to MaxLinear’s participation in ownership of the patents-in-suit, its failure to adhere to the requirements of MoCA with respect to its sale and transfer of the patents-in-suit to Entropic and with respect to MaxLinear’s acts in concert with Entropic with respect to the patents-in-suit.

~~508. Entropic admits that the Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard.~~

³ By virtue of this pleading, the DISH Defendants request permissive joinder of DISH Technologies as a counterclaim-plaintiff under Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(1) as all of the DISH entities’ counterclaims arise out of the same transaction or occurrence (e.g., the MoCA IPR Policy) and include numerous questions of law and fact common to all DISH entities, as set forth below.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ~~509.——Dish California does not accept Entropic’s contention that the Asserted~~
2 ~~Patents in this action are necessary to products that implement any MoCA standard.~~
3 ~~Also, to the extent Dish California products implement any part of any MoCA~~
4 ~~standard, Dish California does not concede that any implementations of those parts in~~
5 ~~its products practice the Asserted Patents. Nonetheless, Dish California has relied~~
6 ~~upon Entropic and/or its predecessors in interests’ membership in MoCA and, on~~
7 ~~information and belief, Entropic and/or its predecessors in interests’ agreement to be~~
8 ~~bound by the MoCA IPR Policy, that all patent controversies may be avoided based~~
9 ~~on the offer of patent licenses on reasonable rates and non-discriminatory terms and~~
10 ~~conditions.~~

11 ~~510.——To the extent the Asserted Patents cover Essential Patent Claims as~~
12 ~~defined in the MoCA IPR Policy and because MaxLinear, Entropic, and/or its~~
13 ~~predecessors in interest promised that it would license any such patents on fair,~~
14 ~~reasonable, and non-discriminatory terms and conditions, companies that rely on~~
15 ~~those commitments are entitled to avoid becoming embroiled in patent controversies~~
16 ~~and to receive the benefit of an offer of a reasonable and non-discriminatory license.~~

17 ~~511.——Accordingly, Dish California seeks relief arising from MaxLinear,~~
18 ~~Entropic, and/or its predecessors in interests’ tortious conduct in filing the present~~
19 ~~action and the circumstances surrounding the filing. In addition, Dish California~~
20 ~~seeks relief from MaxLinear, Entropic, and/or its predecessors in interests’ violation~~
21 ~~of their obligations, pursuant to the MoCA IPR Policy, by demanding excessive and~~
22 ~~discriminatory royalties from Dish California for patents that Entropic contends are~~
23 ~~essential to the MoCA standards.~~

24 2. Technical standards are essential to the modern world. The adoption of
25 standardized technology allows for interoperability between devices made by
26 different manufacturers. Generally speaking, product designers and manufacturers
27 are willing to invest heavily in the development of equipment and software compliant
28 with technical standards because of the promise that the equipment and software will

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 operate with other devices and software compliant with the standard. Standards may
2 also reduce the investment needed to develop new technologies as the cost of
3 developing technologies can be spread among various companies working together to
4 create the standard.

5 3. However, technical standards also create risks of “lock-in” and “patent
6 hold-up.” “Lock-in” refers to a problem whereby, once a standard has been widely-
7 accepted in an industry, it can be difficult for a company to choose not to use the
8 standard. “Patent Hold-Up” refers to a problem where a single patent owner can
9 “hold-up” an entire industry based on claims that the patent-owner’s patents are
10 necessary to practice the standard. Thus, while standards have great benefits,
11 standards also present a significant risk that a single company can encourage adoption
12 of its patented technology into a standard, lie around in wait for the standard to be
13 widely-adopted, and then demand exorbitant damages—lest a company be at a severe
14 competitive disadvantage from no longer being able to implement the standardized
15 technology.

16 4. To address these potential risks—and to avoid falling afoul of the anti-
17 trust laws—standards organizations have adopted policies governing how the
18 promulgators of a standard behave with respect to those who choose to implement the
19 standard. Generally, such policies require that patent owners who contribute to the
20 creation of a standard, or who are members of the standards-setting organization,
21 promise to grant licenses to patents to any implementor of the standard on fair,
22 reasonable, and non-discriminatory (“RAND”) terms.

23 5. As courts have found, the RAND promise must be available to all-
24 comers, regardless of whether the potential licensee is a member of the standards-
25 setting organization. Without the guarantee that RAND terms are available to all, a
26 small number of companies may be able to coordinate to develop a standard, cross-
27 license each other, but then hold-up all others once a standard has become widely-
28 adopted.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 6. As with most standards-setting organizations, MoCA has promulgated a
2 policy directing how organizations that participate in its standards-setting are to
3 behave with respect to licensing of intellectual property related to MoCA standards.
4 Also, as with most standards-setting organizations, MoCA directs its members, and
5 those members agree, to license intellectual property essential to the practice of
6 MoCA standards on “reasonable and non-discriminatory” (“RAND”) terms. This is
7 a contractual promise between each member and MoCA and between the members,
8 for the benefit of those members and other organizations that choose to implement
9 MoCA standards.

10 7. Entropic Communications, Inc. (“Original Entropic”)—the original
11 assignee of the patents currently asserted by Entropic in this case—agreed as a
12 member of MoCA to license patents essential to MoCA on RAND terms.
13 MaxLinear—a member of MoCA’s Board of Directors since 2015—affirmed that
14 promise when it acquired Original Entropic. However, when MaxLinear sold the
15 patents originally owned by Original Entropic to the Entropic entity that is the plaintiff
16 in this case, it failed to include language required by MoCA concerning RAND and
17 misrepresented whether the patents were RAND encumbered. Since acquiring the
18 Original Entropic patents, the Entropic entity that is the plaintiff in this case has failed
19 to honor Original Entropic’s and MaxLinear’s RAND promises, and has failed to offer
20 DISH RAND terms despite DISH’s repeated requests.

21 8. Accordingly, DISH seeks relief arising from MaxLinear’s and Entropic’s
22 tortious conduct relating to the transfer of the patents currently asserted against DISH
23 and the filing of the present lawsuit. DISH also seeks redress for MaxLinear’s and
24 Entropic’s conduct in violation of the anti-trust laws. DISH also seeks to hold
25 Entropic to the promises made by the predecessors-in-interest to patents asserted in
26 this case, and for redresses for Entropic (and MaxLinear’s) breaches of their
27 contractual duties to MoCA, MoCA members, and MoCA implementors.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

PARTIES

9. Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff DISH Network Corporation is a Nevada corporation, with a principal place of business at 9601 S. Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, Colorado 80112

10. Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff DISH Network L.L.C. is a Colorado Limited Liability Company, with a principal place of business at 9601 S. Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, Colorado 80112.

11. Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff Dish Network Service, L.L.C. is a Colorado Limited Liability Company, with a principal place of business at 9601 S. Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, Colorado 80112.

~~542.12.~~ Defendant and Counterclaim-Plaintiff Dish California is a ~~wholly owned subsidiary of DISH Network L.L.C., and is a~~ Colorado Corporation with its principal place of business at 9601 S. Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, Colorado 80112.

13. Counterclaim-Plaintiff DISH Technologies L.L.C. is a Colorado Corporation with its principal place of business at 9601 S. Meridian Boulevard, Englewood, Colorado 80112.

~~543.14.~~ On information and belief, Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant Entropic Communications LLC is a Delaware limited liability company with an office at 7150 Preston Road, Suite 300, Plano, Texas 75024.

~~544.15.~~ On information and belief, MaxLinear, Inc., a Counterclaim-Defendant, is a Delaware corporation, with a principal place of business at 5966 La Place Court Suite 100, Carlsbad, CA 92008.

~~545.16.~~ On information and belief, MaxLinear Communications LLC is an affiliate of MaxLinear, Inc., and is a Delaware limited liability company with a principal place of business at 5966 La Place Court Suite 100, Carlsbad, CA 92008. Collectively, MaxLinear, Inc. and MaxLinear Communications LLC are referred to as “MaxLinear.”

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

~~516.17.~~ Dish-California'sDISH's declaratory judgment counterclaims arise under Title 35 of the United States Code. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over them under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 2201, and 2202 as they arise under an Act of Congress relating to patents, patent infringement, and the Declaratory Judgment Act. This Court has jurisdiction over DISH's anti-trust claims pursuant to at least 15 U.S.C. § 1. In addition, the Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367, because the state law counterclaims form part of the same case or controversy and arise from a common nucleus of operative fact as the federal patent infringement claims being asserted against ~~Dish-California~~DISH by Entropic.

~~517.18.~~ Entropic has consented to personal jurisdiction by commencing an action alleging patent infringement in this District, as set forth in Entropic's Complaint.

~~518.19.~~ This Court has general personal jurisdiction over MaxLinear because MaxLinear conducts systematic and regular business within the State of California by, *inter alia*, providing integrated circuits and software products, as well as systems-on-chip solutions used for multimarket applications.

~~519.20.~~ Upon information and belief, MaxLinear maintains a regular and established place of business within this district at 50 Parker, Irvine, CA 92618.

~~520.21.~~ Venue over ~~Dish-California's~~DISH's counterclaims is proper, to the extent that venue over Entropic's claims is proper, under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(b).

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Multimedia over Coax Alliance (“MoCA”)

22. MoCA is an independent, non-profit standard-setting organization (“SSO”) that produces accepted standards for in-home networking.⁴ MoCA’s founding More specifically, MoCA promulgates, publishes, and promotes standards that allow for IP networking using legacy coaxial cabling.

521.23. MoCA was founded in 2004. Founding members in 2004 included Cisco Systems, Comcast, EchoStar, Technologies Corporation (an affiliate of DISH), Entropic Communications, Matsushita Electric (Panasonic), Motorola, Radio Shack Corporation, and Toshiba.⁵ By 2008, additional digital entertainment providers such as Cox, Verizon, AT&T, DirecTV, and Time Warner Cable joined MoCA.⁶ In addition to digital entertainment providers, silicon makers such as Broadcom Corporation (by way of its acquisition of Octalica), Conexant Systems, Inc., BroadLight, Inc., Applied Micro Circuits Corporation, and Texas Instruments

⁴ MoCA Frequently Asked Questions (mocalliance.org), <https://mocalliance.org/about/faqs.php> (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)

⁵ “8 Technology Leaders Form Multimedia Over Coax Alliance to Enable Entertainment Devices to Interconnect Throughout the Home Via Coax Cabling,” *MoCA*, January 5, 2004 (archive), *available at* https://web.archive.org/web/20150204230050/http://www.mocalliance.org/news/pr_040105_8_tech_leaders_form_moca.htm (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)

⁶ Cox and Verizon Join Multimedia over Coax Alliance, https://web.archive.org/web/20150204230053/https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_050809_cox_and_verizon_joins_moca.htm (last visited Sept. 21, 2023); AT&T Laboratories [sic] Is Newest Member of MoCA™, https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_060606_ATandT_Joins_MoCA.php (last visited Sept. 21, 2023); DirecTV Joins MoCA, https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_050508_directv_joins_moca.php (last visited Sept. 21, 2023); Time Warner Cable Joins MoCA, https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_070108_time_warner_cable_joins_moca.php (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 joined MoCA including as contributors.⁷ ViXS Systems Inc. joined MoCA on
2 September 10, 2009.⁸

3 ~~522. EchoStar (an affiliate of Dish California) was a founding member of~~
4 ~~MoCA in 2004.⁹ On information and belief, affiliates of Dish California were~~
5 ~~exploring multiple alternatives for home networking technologies for transmission of~~
6 ~~video including via Ethernet and wireless mediums. On information and belief,~~
7 ~~affiliates of Dish California were also seeking to develop a standard that multiple~~
8 ~~manufacturers could implement to foster multiple sources of supply. On information~~
9 ~~and belief, EchoStar (now DISH Technologies L.L.C., an affiliate of Dish California)~~
10 ~~participated in MoCA because of the commitment of its members, including Entropic~~
11 ~~Communications, Inc., that MoCA technology would be licensed to allow other~~
12 ~~manufacturers to use MoCA related patents.~~

13
14
15 ⁷ Broadcom, Conexant and BroadLight Upgrade to MoCA's New,
16 [https://www.globenewswire.com/news-](https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2007/06/26/361527/7047/en/Broadcom-Conexant-and-BroadLight-Upgrade-to-MoCA-s-New-Contributor-Class.html)
17 [release/2007/06/26/361527/7047/en/Broadcom-Conexant-and-BroadLight-Upgrade-](https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2007/06/26/361527/7047/en/Broadcom-Conexant-and-BroadLight-Upgrade-to-MoCA-s-New-Contributor-Class.html)
18 [to-MoCA-s-New-Contributor-Class.html](https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2007/06/26/361527/7047/en/Broadcom-Conexant-and-BroadLight-Upgrade-to-MoCA-s-New-Contributor-Class.html) (last visited Sept. 21, 2023); Broadcom
19 Jump Starts MOCA Strategy | Light Reading, [https://www.lightreading.com/cable-](https://www.lightreading.com/cable-video/broadcom-jump-starts-moca-strategy/d/d-id/641350)
20 [video/broadcom-jump-starts-moca-strategy/d/d-id/641350](https://www.lightreading.com/cable-video/broadcom-jump-starts-moca-strategy/d/d-id/641350) (last visited Sept. 21,
21 2023); MoCA Adds Additional Silicon Vendor,
22 https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_060214_MoCA_Adds_Silicon_Vendor.php (last
23 visited Sept. 21, 2023); MoCA Adds Another Silicon Vendor in AMCC,
24 https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_060829_MoCA_Adds_AMCC.php (last visited
25 Sept. 21, 2023); MoCA™ Expands Membership to Include Texas Instruments,
26 https://mocalliance.org/news/pr_061106_MoCA_Adds_Texas_Instruments.php (last
27 visited Sept. 21, 2023)

28 ⁸ ViXS Systems Joins MoCA®,
https://mocalliance.org/news/prM_090910_ViXS_Systems_Joins_MoCA.php (last
visited Sept. 21, 2023)

⁹ ~~“8 Technology Leaders Form Multimedia Over Coax Alliance to Enable~~
~~Entertainment Devices to Interconnect Throughout the Home Via Coax Cabling,”~~
~~MoCA, January 5, 2004 (archive), available at~~
~~[https://web.archive.org/web/20150204230050/http://www.mocalliance.org/news/pr_](https://web.archive.org/web/20150204230050/http://www.mocalliance.org/news/pr_040105_8_tech_leaders_form_moca.htm)~~
~~040105_8_tech_leaders_form_moca.htm~~ (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

523. ~~MaxLinear, Inc. joined MoCA as an associate member as of August 17, 2011.⁴⁰ MaxLinear, Inc. acquired Entropic Communications Inc. in 2015, after which MaxLinear, Inc. became a member of the MoCA Board of Directors.⁴¹ MaxLinear, Inc. remains a member of the MoCA Board of Directors.⁴² On information and belief, MaxLinear signed a membership agreement for MoCA.~~

524. ~~In general, industry standards such as those promulgated by MoCA, are beneficial because they help allow devices created by one company to communicate with devices made by another, and component manufacturers can implement standards that will operate in a variety of end products. Standardization, therefore, helps ensure products created by one company will interoperate with another company's products. By as early as 2005, MoCA companies had demonstrated interoperability.⁴³~~

525. ~~Industry standards, however, can harm competition and consumers when companies, such as Entropic, allege they own patents they deem essential to the standards and then demand excessive royalties for their use. Inclusion of a patented technology in a standard can grant substantial market power to the patent owner. Although alternative technologies may be selected while developing the standard, once a standard is adopted, those alternatives often may no longer be workable. Companies using certain aspects of the standard—such as by incorporating MoCA compatible chips in set top boxes—make substantial investments that are tied to using~~

⁴⁰ ~~MaxLinear Signs Up to MoCA, https://mocalliance.org/news/prM_110817_MaxLinear_Signs_Up_to_MoCA.php (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)~~

⁴¹ ~~MaxLinear, Inc., Joins MoCA Board of Directors, <https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2015/05/13/735634/7047/en/MaxLinear-Inc-Joins-MoCA-Board-of-Directors.html> (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)~~

⁴² ~~Board of Directors, <https://mocalliance.org/about/board.php> (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)~~

⁴³ ~~MoCA Completes Plugfest For 270 Mbps Home Nets over Coax—Converge Digest, <https://convergedigest.com/moca-completes-plugfest-for-270-mbps/> (last visited Sept. 21, 2023)~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

~~the standard. The costs associated with abandoning the previously adopted standard in favor of an alternative may be completely infeasible for technical or economic reasons unrelated to the value of the underlying patented technology. As a result, the industry may become “locked in” to a standard.~~

~~526. SSOs, such as MoCA, have adopted policies to address the potential harms from lock in of a standard, including the risk that patent holders can “hold up” users of the standard by taking advantage of their dependence on the standard. SSOs such as MoCA also adopt these policies to ensure that standard setting is pro-competitive and not open to abuse.~~

~~24. MoCA adopted such a policy. MoCA’s The first version of the MoCA standard (Version 1.0) was ratified and published in 2006. Since that time, MoCA members have continued to develop newer versions of the MoCA Standard. MoCA 1.1 was published in 2007, with an Extension published in 2010. MoCA 2.0 was published in 2010. MoCA 2.5 was published in 2016; and MoCA 3.0 was published in 2021.~~

The MoCA Contract

~~25. According to MoCA, “MoCA® provides a forum and environment where Alliance members meet to develop multi-gigabit coaxial connectivity standards.”¹⁴ However, in order to participate in MoCA, Alliance members must enter into contracts with MoCA that govern the member’s behavior with respect to MoCA.~~

~~26. On information and belief, and as set forth in the MoCA Corporate Bylaws,~~ [REDACTED]

¹⁴ “About MoCA(r), the Multimedia over Coax Alliance,” available at <https://mocalliance.org/about/index.php> (last visited January 9, 2024).

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

¹⁵ Exhibit 1, MoCA Bylaws at ¶¶ 3.1-3.3.

27. As set forth in the MoCA Bylaws,

An exemplar un-executed Promoter Member Agreement is attached as Exhibit 2 (“Promoter Member Agreement”).

28. Pursuant to the terms of the Promoter Member Agreement, the Promoter Member agrees to abide by the MoCA Intellectual Property Rights (“IPR”) Policy and “Antitrust Guidelines,” both attachments to the Promoter Member Agreement. Promoter Member Agreement, §§ 3.1, 6. Thus, the Promoter Agreement, including the IPR Policy and the Antitrust Guidelines, constitute an enforceable contract between the Promoter Member, MoCA, and the other members of MoCA.

29. A true and correct copy of the MoCA IPR Policy is attached as Exhibit 3.¹⁶

527-30. Pursuant to its express terms, MoCA’s IPR Policy “applies to all Alliance Parties and their Affiliates (as defined below)[.]”⁴⁷ MoCA IPR Policy § 1. The IPR defines “Alliance Party(ies)” as “a Participant or a Voting Member.” MoCA IPR Policy § 2. One objective of MoCA’s IPR policy was to “maximize the likelihood of widespread adoption of such specifications.” MoCA IPR Policy § 1.

528-31. As to the rights and obligations, the MoCA IPR Policy requires each member to grant a license to “Essential Patent Claims” in Section 5.1.1: “[E]ach

¹⁵ A copy of the MoCA Corporate Bylaws (“Bylaws”) is attached as Exhibit 1. DISH reserves the right to address other versions of the Corporate Bylaws should Entropic and/or MaxLinear contend that a different version is applicable to the present dispute.

¹⁶ The relevant version of the IPR Policy is attached as Exhibit 3. To the extent Entropic and/or MaxLinear alleges that another revision of the IPR Policy should apply, DISH reserves the right to address other versions of the IPR Policy.

⁴⁷ MoCA IPR Policy, publicly available at <https://www.essentialpatentblog.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/64/2013/05/MOCA-IPR-Policy-Approved-1-24-11.pdf> (last visited Sept. 21, 2023).

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

Alliance Party shall offer to license to the requesting Alliance Party(ies) . . . such Alliance Party's and its Affiliates' Essential Patent Claims to the extent necessary to use, make, have made, offer for sale, sell and import Fully Compliant Products in conformance with or as described in such Approved Draft Deliverable." The MoCA IPR ~~policy~~ Policy requires the license be fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory: "Such licenses shall be non-exclusive, non-transferable, non-sublicensable, world wide, and on fair, reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions (collectively, 'RAND') which may include defensive suspension provisions." MoCA IPR Policy § 5.1.1.

529.32. The MoCA IPR Policy also includes an anti-circumvention clause. Specifically, the policy states: "Each Alliance Party further represents and warrants and agrees that it has not and will not intentionally transfer or otherwise encumber its patents that reasonably may contain Essential Patent Claims for the purpose of circumventing the obligation to grant licenses contained in this IPR Policy." MoCA IPR Policy § 4.1.2. Should a transfer of "Essential Patent Claims" take place, the IPR Policy requires "any agreement for transferring or assigning Essential Patent Claims includes a provision that such transfer or assignment is subject to existing licenses and obligations to license imposed on the Alliance Party by this Agreement and the Alliance Bylaws." MoCA IPR Policy § 5.1.2.

33. On information and belief, including because it was a founding member of MoCA, Original Entropic executed a "Promoter Member Agreement" or agreement of similar scope. Pursuant to the terms of the Promoter Member Agreement,

[REDACTED]

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 34. On information and belief, including because MaxLinear is listed as a
2 “Promoter” and member of MoCA’s Board of Directors on MoCA’s website,¹⁸
3 MaxLinear executed a “Promoter Member Agreement” or agreement of similar scope.
4 See Ex. 4. Pursuant to the terms of the Promoter Member Agreement, [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 35. “Voting Members” and “Participants” (i.e., “Associates” and
12 “Contributors”) must also execute agreements (see MoCA Bylaws §§ 3.2, 3.3).
13 Exemplar copies of agreements executed by “Participants” are attached as Exhibit 5
14 (“Contributor Agreement”) and Exhibit 6 (“Associate Agreement”). Each of these
15 agreements also require that members comply with the terms of the IPR Policy. See
16 Contributor Agreement, § 4; Associate Agreement, § 4. On information and belief,
17 at least MaxLinear has also executed at least the Associate Agreement. See Ex. 7.

18
19 **Events Leading to DISH’s Counterclaims**

20 36. DISH has been forced to bring these counterclaims to vindicate the
21 promises embodied in the MoCA IPR Policy and to seek redress for the harms it has
22 suffered for MaxLinear’s and Entropic’s actions in violation of the MoCA IPR Policy.

23 37. In its complaint and infringement contentions, Entropic alleges that the
24 DISH Defendants infringe certain claims (“the Asserted Claims”) of U.S. Patent Nos.
25 U.S. Patent Nos. 7,295,518; 7,594,249; 7,889,75; 8,085,802; 9,838,213; 10,432,422;
26 8,631,450; 8,621,539; 8,320,566; 10,257,566; 8,228,910; 8,363,681 (collectively,

27
28 ¹⁸ See “Our Members,” available at <https://mocalliance.org/about/members.php>

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 “the Asserted Patents” or “Asserted Patents”). Entropic’s allegations of infringement
2 are based on DISH’s alleged incorporation of MoCA standards into its products.

3 38. Entropic has alleged that the Asserted Claims are necessarily infringed
4 by compliance with at least one version of the MoCA Standards. As such, as Entropic
5 has alleged infringement, the Asserted Claims are “Essential Patent Claims” as
6 defined by the MoCA IPR Policy. See MoCA IPR Policy, Definitions.

7 39. For the avoidance of doubt, DISH does not accept Entropic’s contention
8 that the Asserted Claims in this action are necessary to products that implement any
9 MoCA standard. Also, to the extent DISH products implement any part of any MoCA
10 standard, DISH does not concede that any implementations of those parts in its
11 products practice the Asserted Claims. Nonetheless, DISH has relied upon Entropic
12 and/or its predecessors-in-interests’ membership in MoCA and, on information and
13 belief, Entropic and/or its predecessors-in-interests’ agreement to be bound by the
14 MoCA IPR Policy, that all patent controversies may be avoided based on the offer of
15 patent licenses on reasonable rates and non-discriminatory terms and conditions.

16 40. As noted above, the patents in this case were originally assigned to
17 Original Entropic. Because Original Entropic, on information and belief, executed
18 the Promoter Member Agreement (or similar agreement), and to the extent the
19 Asserted Claims are Essential Patent Claims as defined in the MoCA IPR Policy,
20 Original Entropic and any subsequent owner or assignee of the Asserted Patents is
21 obligated to license the Asserted Patents on RAND terms.

22 41. Original Entropic acknowledged its obligation to comply with the MoCA
23 IPR Policy. In its 2012 Annual Report filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange
24 Commission, it stated that, “[i]n connection with our membership in MoCA, we are
25 required to license any of our patent claims that are essential to implement the MoCA
26 specification to other MoCA members under reasonable and non-discriminatory
27 terms.”

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 42. MaxLinear acquired Original Entropic (including the Asserted Patents)
2 in 2015.

3 43. Because MaxLinear, on information and belief, has at least executed a
4 Promoter Member Agreement and an Associate Agreement (or similar agreements),
5 and to the extent the Asserted Claims are Essential Patent Claims as defined in the
6 MoCA IPR Policy, MaxLinear and any subsequent owner or assignee of the Asserted
7 Patents is obligated to license the Asserted Patents on RAND terms.

8 44. On information and belief, including at least because MaxLinear touted
9 Entropic's MoCA patent portfolio in its 2015 and 2016 Annual Reports, MaxLinear
10 was aware of Original Entropic's assertions that many of its patents were essential to
11 the implementation of MoCA standards. Moreover, on information and belief,
12 including at least because of MaxLinear's prior involvement with MoCA, MaxLinear
13 was aware of the MoCA IPR Policy and the obligation to license MoCA essential
14 patents on RAND terms.

15 45. However, MaxLinear reneged on the promises it made pursuant to the
16 MoCA IPR Policy in 2021 when it transferred the Asserted Patents to Entropic.

17 46. The MoCA IPR Policy provides that "[a]ny sale, assignment or other
18 transfer by an Alliance Party or its Affiliates to an unaffiliated third party of an
19 Essential Patent Claim shall be subject to the terms in this IPR Policy." MoCA IPR
20 Policy, § 5.1.2. Moreover, the MoCA IPR Policy requires that "any agreement for
21 transferring or assigning Essential Patent Claims includes a provision that such
22 transfer or assignment is subject to . . . obligations to license imposed on the Alliance
23 Party by this Agreement." *Id.*

24 47. The Patent Purchase Agreement that transferred the rights in the
25 Asserted Patents from MaxLinear to Entropic [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED]
27 [REDACTED] To the contrary, MaxLinear represented in the Patent Purchase Agreement
28 [REDACTED]

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED] See
5 Ex. 8.

6 48. Since its acquisition of the Asserted Patents, Entropic has made no effort
7 to comply with the MoCA IPR Policy.

8 49. On March 9, 2022, Entropic sent a letter to Mr. Tim Messner, General
9 Counsel for DISH Network LLC at that time, alleging that DISH’s “satellite television
10 services infringe certain claims of these patent.” The charts alleging infringement
11 attached as an exhibit to that letter contain multiple references to MoCA. The letter
12 makes no reference to the MoCA IPR Policy, nor does it make any offer to license
13 the Asserted Patents on RAND terms.

14 50. On May 3, 2022, Messrs. Max Gratton and Ira Jamshidi discussed
15 licensing Entropic’s patent portfolio—including the Asserted Patents—with
16 Entropic’s CEO Mr. Boris Teksler. On that call, Messrs. Gratton and Jamshidi
17 requested a licensing proposal from Entropic on behalf of DISH Network L.L.C. and
18 all DISH entities, which Entropic agreed to provide. No license proposal was
19 forthcoming.

20 51. On July 14, 2022, Entropic again agreed to provide terms for a license.
21 Again, though, no license proposal was forthcoming.

22 52. On December 28, 2022, Mr. Teksler sent another letter to Mr. Messner.
23 In that letter, Mr. Teksler and Entropic committed “to licensing its patents that cover
24 MoCA technology on reasonable terms, without discrimination among similarly-
25 situated providers (often called ‘RAND terms.’).” Still—no license proposal was
26 forthcoming.

27 53. Instead of providing license terms, Entropic brought two suits against
28 DISH entities. Entropic filed the present lawsuit on February 10, 2023. As with its

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 previous letter, Entropic’s allegations of infringement center on MoCA standards.
2 However, Entropic’s complaint contains no reference to the MoCA IPR Policy nor
3 any obligation to license the Asserted Patents on RAND terms.

4 54. On March 31, 2023, Mr. Gratton again asked Entropic to provide license
5 terms. In this written correspondence, Mr. Gratton “reiterate[d] [his] request for
6 Entropic’s RAND-compliant offer on the patents asserted as essential to the MOCA
7 standard” and specifically requested Entropic’s “RAND licensing rate sheet for the
8 standard-essential patents.” Again, though, no licensing proposal was received.

9 55. In a letter dated November 10, 2023, Mr. James Hanft, Vice President
10 and Associate General Counsel for DISH Network L.L.C., again asked Entropic for a
11 RAND-compliant offer. In that letter, Mr. Hanft detailed this history of the
12 negotiations, including Entropic continuing failure to provide any RAND rates or a
13 RAND-compliant offer, and noted “Entropic has no excuse for failing to provide such
14 terms.” Ex. 9.

15 56. To date, Entropic has refused to provide *any* licensing proposal, and the
16 only monetary terms Entropic has identified is its claim for \$1,000,000,000 (One
17 Billion Dollars), which it claims are the damages it is seeking in the present lawsuit.
18 (See D.I. 76 at 11).

19 57. To date, Entropic has refused to confirm that it has any obligation to
20 license the patents which it claims are essential to MoCA standards on RAND terms
21 or that it will make a license offer compliant with its obligations during the pendency
22 of this lawsuit.

23
24 **DISH Technologies Has Standing to Enforce the MoCA IPR Policy**

25 58. At least DISH Technologies has standing to enforce the MoCA IPR
26 Policy in the present suit because it is a former member of MoCA and because it has
27 and will continue to be harmed by Entropic and MaxLinear’s refusal to license on
28 RAND terms and other wrongful conduct.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 59. Dish Technologies was previously a Promoter Member of MoCA. More
2 specifically, Dish Technologies was previously named EchoStar Technologies, who
3 executed a Promoter Member Agreement at least as of 2004. EchoStar Technologies
4 continued to be a member, including serving on the Board of Directors of MoCA,
5 until 2019.

6 60. The MoCA IPR Policy explicitly provides that former members may
7 enforce its terms.

8 61. For example, the MoCA IPR Policy provides that a “terminated Alliance
9 Party shall be entitled to request or require any Alliance Party to license such Alliance
10 Party’s Essential Patent Claims under Section 5.1 (RAND Licenses), but only to the
11 extent necessary to use, make, have made, offer for sale, sell and import Fully
12 Compliant Products in conformance with or as described in Draft Deliverables or
13 Approved Draft Deliverables approved by the Board of Directors prior to such
14 expiration or termination[.]” MoCA IPR Policy, §7.1.

15 62. DISH Technologies sells the DISH “Hopper” and “Joey” – products
16 implicated in Entropic’s Complaint. According to the explicit terms of the MoCA
17 IPR policy, DISH Technologies thus shall be “entitled” to require Entropic and/or
18 MaxLinear to license patents essential to MoCA Standards on RAND terms. DISH
19 Technologies therefore has standing to bring claims to enforce the terms of the IPR
20 Policy.

21 63. Moreover, DISH Technologies has been harmed by Entropic’s and
22 MaxLinear’s wrongful behavior. Entropic’s failure to license on RAND terms,
23 MaxLinear’s failure to include RAND encumbrances in its assignment to Entropic,
24 and the other wrongful acts undertaken by Entropic and MaxLinear, has harmed DISH
25 Technologies’ ability to sell its product, including by raising its costs through this
26 lawsuit. Moreover, DISH Technologies has also suffered diminution of reputation in
27 the marketplace, including its reputation as an innovator. These harms underline
28 DISH Technologies’ standing to enforce the terms of the MoCA IPR policy.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

The DISH Defendants Have Standing to Enforce the MoCA IPR Policy

64. The DISH Defendants each also have standing to enforce the MoCA IPR Policy because they are at least third-party beneficiaries of the promises embodied in the IPR Policy.

65. As courts have found, “[c]ompanies seeking to license under [FRAND] terms become third-party beneficiaries of the contract between the [SEP] holder and the [Standards Setting Organization (SSO)]. They are thus enabled to enforce the terms of that contract.” *HTC Corp. v. Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson*, 12 F.4th 476, 481 (5th Cir. 2021); *Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola, Inc.*, 795 F.3d 1024, 1031 (9th Cir. 2015) (finding “an SEP holder cannot refuse a license to a manufacturer who commits to paying the RAND rate ...”).

66. In order to comply with anti-trust laws, RAND licenses must be made available to both members *and* non-members of the SSO. *See, e.g., Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Sys., Inc.*, 773 F.3d 1201, 1209 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (noting that the FRAND commitment ensures that any standard implementor “cannot . . . maintain[] a patent monopoly” by refusing to “licens[e] others to use the invention or by granting licenses under special conditions designed to preserve that monopoly.”). This is because RAND obligations exist to protect the parties that must adopt a standard in order to conduct their business—regardless of membership in the SSO. If the RAND-promise were limited to only members of the SSO, then a small group of companies could work together to create a standard and then hold up others who wish to make interoperable devices or services with exorbitant patent rates.

67. Entropic alleges that DISH has implemented MoCA standards. DISH has also asked for RAND terms for the license. Accordingly, DISH is and should be a third-party beneficiary of the MoCA IPR Policy.

68. The MoCA IPR Policy is consistent. For example, the MoCA IPR Policy explains that the policy “is intended to maximize the likelihood of widespread adoption” of MoCA specification. MoCA IPR Policy, § 1. Widespread adoption is

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 only possible when the RAND promise applies to any implementor of the MoCA
2 standards beyond the handful of member companies.

3 69. In line with this stated goal, MoCA routinely promoted the use of MoCA
4 technology by non-members. For example, MoCA published brochures urging in-
5 home television service providers and installers, such as the DISH Defendants, to
6 adopt MoCA technology. See, e.g., Ex. 10. Such promotion did not indicate that a
7 company need be a member of MoCA in order to avoid exorbitant non-RAND patent
8 licensing demands. See id.

9 70. The MoCA IPR Policy also provides that the policy “is designed and
10 intended to comply with all applicable law, including federal and state anti-trust
11 laws.” MoCA IPR Policy, § 1. In order to comply with anti-trust laws, a SSO’s
12 RAND guarantee must apply to all-comers, not just members.

13 71. The DISH Defendants are also intended beneficiaries of the MoCA IPR
14 Policy because of their relationship with former MoCA member companies.

15 72. As discussed above, at least EchoStar Technologies Corporation
16 (“EchoStar”)—now DISH Technologies, LLC—was previously a promoter member
17 of MoCA. The DISH Defendants are either sister subsidiaries or parent corporations
18 of DISH Technologies, LLC.

19 73. Moreover, while it had not executed a formal agreement, “DISH”
20 (collectively) became a de facto member of MoCA through a course of conduct. In
21 its internal MoCA documents relating to meetings of the Board of Directors spanning
22 at least three years, for example, “DISH” (without specifying which DISH entity) is
23 listed as a member of MoCA’s Board of Directors and DISH’s MoCA representative
24 participated in meetings of the Board of Directors. See, e.g., Ex. 11 at 3 (May 9, 2017,
25 Agenda for Board of Director’s Meeting, Listing “DISH” as a member of the Board);
26 Ex. 12 at 1 (minutes from May 9, 2017, meeting, listing “DISH” as a member of the
27 Board); Ex. 13 (record of attendance for Board Members, listing “DISH”); Ex. 14 at
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

3 3 (June 2017 Board meeting Agenda, listing “DISH”); Ex. 15 (similar); Ex. 16 at 3
4 (similar); Ex. 17 (similar); Ex. 18 at 3 (similar); Ex. 19 (similar); Ex. 20 (similar).

5 74. Pursuant to the MoCA IPR Policy, owners of MoCA-essential patents
6 must grant RAND licenses “to the extent necessary” for the licensee “to use, make,
7 have made, offer for sale, sell and import” products compliant with MoCA standards.
8 MoCA IPR Policy, § 5.1.1. Plainly, as is contemplated by this provision, such a
9 license must extend not only to whichever corporate entity is a member of MoCA, but
10 also to related companies whose activities are “necessary” for the licensee to
11 implement MoCA technologies. Accordingly, as is contemplated by the IPR Policy
12 itself, entities such as the DISH Defendants are intended beneficiaries of the RAND
13 promise.

COUNT I:

(As Against Counter-Defendant Entropic)

**DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT DISH CALIFORNIA
IS ENTITLED TO LICENSE THE ASSERTED PATENTS FROM
ENTROPIC ON RAND TERMS**

17 ~~530.75. Counterclaim Plaintiff Dish California~~DISH incorporates and realleges
18 the allegations set forth in ~~Affirmative and Additional Defenses and Its~~ Counterclaim
19 Paragraphs ~~480-529,1-74,~~ above, as if set forth fully herein.

20 ~~531.76.~~ Subject to the terms and conditions of the MoCA IPR Policy, Entropic
21 and/or its predecessors-in-interest, including MaxLinear, made contractual
22 commitments and are obligated to offer to ~~Dish California~~DISH, and its affiliates,
23 licenses to its essential patents on RAND terms and conditions if Entropic’s admission
24 that the Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the
25 MoCA standard is true. The MoCA IPR Policy states, “each Alliance Party shall offer
26 to license to the requesting Alliance Party(ies), under the terms of a separate written
27 agreement, such Alliance Party’s and its Affiliates’ Essential Patent Claims to the
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 extent necessary to use, make, have made, offer for sale, sell and import Fully
2 Compliant Products in conformance with or as described in such Approved Draft
3 Deliverable. Such licenses shall be non-exclusive, non-transferable, non-sub-
4 licensable, world wide, and on fair, reasonable[,] and nondiscriminatory terms and
5 conditions (collectively, 'RAND') which may include defensive suspension
6 provisions." MoCA IPR Policy § 5.1.1.

7 ~~532.77.~~ On information and belief, Entropic and MaxLinear are bound by the
8 terms of Section 5.1.1 at least through the assignment of the Asserted Patents from
9 Original Entropic Communications Inc. and MaxLinear under the MoCA IPR Policy,
10 Section 5.1.2. Section 5.1.2 states: "[a]ny sale, assignment or other transfer by an
11 Alliance Party or its Affiliates to an unaffiliated third party of an Essential Patent
12 Claim shall be subject to the terms in this IPR Policy. . . . [A]ny agreement for
13 transferring or assigning Essential Patent Claims includes a provision that such
14 transfer or assignment is subject to existing licenses and obligations to license
15 imposed on the Alliance Party by this Agreement and the Alliance Bylaws." MoCA
16 IPR Policy § 5.1.2.

17 78. Original Entropic Communications Inc. was, and MaxLinear is, an
18 Alliance Party as that term is defined in Section 2 of the MoCA IPR Policy. MoCA
19 IPR Policy § 2 ("Alliance Party(ies)' means a Participant or a Voting Member.").
20 Entropic Communications Inc. has Original Entropic and MaxLinear at least executed
21 Promoter Member Agreements (or similar agreements), agreeing to the terms of the
22 IPR Policy, constituting binding contracts.

23 ~~533.79.~~ Original Entropic acknowledged its obligation to comply with the
24 RAND obligation in the MoCA IPR Policy. In its 2012 Annual Report it stated "[i]n
25 connection with our membership in MoCA, we are required to license any of our
26 patent claims that are essential to implement the MoCA specification to other MoCA
27 members under reasonable and non-discriminatory terms."

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 534.80. Entropic admits Entropic Communications Inc. is its predecessor-in-
2 interest for the Asserted Patents. Compl. ¶ 17.

3 535.81. Although ~~affiliates for Dish California~~DISH Technologies withdrew
4 from MoCA, ~~Dish California~~DISH Technologies retains its benefits under the MoCA
5 IPR Policy including the right to a RAND license under § 5.1.1 as an affiliate.
6 Specifically, subject to certain conditions, the MoCA IPR Policy provides, a former
7 Alliance Party shall be entitled to request or require any Alliance Party to license such
8 Alliance Party's Essential Patent Claims under Section 5.1 (RAND Licenses)[.]”
9 MoCA IPR Policy § 7.2. On information and belief, ~~the Dish California~~
10 ~~affiliate's~~DISH Technologies' withdrawal from MoCA was not “termination by the
11 Alliance without cause as provided in the Bylaws,” and therefore, ~~Dish~~
12 ~~California~~Technologies retains the benefit of Section 7.2 of the MoCA IPR Policy.
13 These rights are shared with the DISH Defendants as third-party beneficiaries of the
14 MoCA IPR Policy.

15 536.82. Moreover, Entropic has alleged the Asserted Patents are essential to (i.e.,
16 would necessarily be infringed by complying with) MoCA specifications. See
17 Complaint at ¶¶ 93, 127, 161, 195, 229, 263, 297, 331, 365, 399, 433, 467. Entropic
18 has also alleged ~~Dish California's~~DISH's products are “MoCA-compliant” devices.
19 See Complaint at ¶¶ 38-42. Consequently, Section 5.1.1 of the MoCA IPR Policy
20 requires Entropic to offer ~~Dish California~~DISH licenses to the Asserted Patents on
21 RAND terms and conditions if Entropic's admission that the Asserted Patents are
22 standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA standard is true.

23 537.83. Despite repeated requests, including requests made in writing, Entropic
24 has not offered ~~Dish California~~DISH a license to the Asserted Patents on RAND terms
25 and conditions.

26 538.84. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists
27 a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 of a declaratory judgment from this Court confirming Entropic's obligation to license
2 the Asserted Patents on RAND terms and conditions.

3 **COUNT II:**

4 **(As Against Counter-Defendant Entropic)**

5 **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT TO DETERMINE RAND TERMS FOR**
6 **LICENSES TO THE ASSERTED PATENTS**

7 ~~539-85. Counterclaim Plaintiff Dish California~~DISH incorporates and realleges
8 the allegations set forth in ~~Affirmative and Additional Defenses and its~~ Counterclaim
9 Paragraphs ~~480-538, 1-84~~ above, as if set forth fully herein.

10 ~~540-86.~~ As set forth above, by virtue of ~~Entropic Communications Inc. Original~~
11 ~~Entropic's~~ and MaxLinear's participation in MoCA, ~~and Original Entropic's and~~
12 ~~MaxLinear's execution of Promoter Member Agreements (or similar agreements),~~
13 Entropic ~~and MaxLinear are~~ bound by contractual commitments with MoCA and its
14 members and affiliates including ~~Dish California. DISH, including the MoCA IPR~~
15 ~~Policy.~~

16 ~~541-87. Every~~As also set forth above, every party using any MoCA technology
17 is an intended beneficiary of ~~Entropic Communications, Inc.'s, Original~~ Entropic's,
18 and MaxLinear's voluntary contractual commitments to MoCA including the
19 commitment to grant licenses on RAND terms to all that make, use, or sell products
20 supporting the MoCA standards. These voluntary contractual commitments remain
21 binding on Entropic as the predecessor-in-interest to the patents-in-suit.

22 ~~542-88.~~ As set ~~for~~forth above, Entropic has chosen to engage in litigation, rather
23 than good faith negotiation to reach agreement on RAND terms and conditions for
24 ~~Dish California~~DISH to license the Asserted Patents if Entropic's admission that the
25 Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of the MoCA
26 standard is true.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 543.89. Despite repeated requests, including requests made in writing, Entropic
2 has failed to provide ~~Dish California~~DISH with RAND terms and conditions for a
3 license to the Asserted Patents.

4 544.90. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists
5 a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance
6 of a declaratory judgment to this Court setting RAND terms for any necessary licenses
7 to the Asserted Patents.

8 **COUNT III: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT THE ASSIGNMENT OF**
9 **THE ASSERTED PATENTS FROM MAXLINEAR TO ENTROPIC IS VOID**

10 **Counterclaim Plaintiff Dish CaliforniaCOUNT III**

11 **(As Against Counter-Defendant Entropic)**

12 **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

13 545.91. DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in Affirmative
14 and Additional Defenses andIts Counterclaim Paragraphs 480-544, above, 1-90 above,
15 as if set forth fully herein.

16 92. As set forth above, by The MoCA IPR Policy constitutes a valid,
17 enforceable, and binding contract governed by the laws of California.

18 93. Original Entropic agreed to the terms of the MoCA IPR Policy by virtue
19 of Entropic Communications Inc. and MaxLinear's participation in MoCA, executing
20 a Promoter Member agreement (or similar agreement). Moreover, MaxLinear agreed
21 to the terms of the MoCA IPR Policy at least by virtue of executing a Promoter
22 Member Agreement and an Associate Agreement (or similar agreements).

23 94. Because both Original Entropic and MaxLinear are bound by contractual
24 commitments with MoCApredecessors-in-interest to the Asserted Patents, the
25 promises made by Original Entropic and MaxLinear to comply with the terms of the
26 MoCA IPR Policy remain binding on Entropic.

27 95. As set forth above (paragraphs 58-63), DISH Technologies has standing
28 to enforce the MoCA IPR Policy.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 96. As set forth above (paragraphs 64-74), the DISH Defendants are
2 intended third-party beneficiaries of the MoCA IPR Policy and have standing to
3 enforce its members-terms.

4 97. To the extent the MoCA IPR Policy imposes any obligations on DISH,
5 DISH has discharged them. By way of example, DISH made a request, in writing,
6 for a RAND-complaint license offer.

7 98. Entropic has breached section 5.1.1 of the MoCA IPR Policy. Section
8 5.1.1 provides that Entropic must “offer to license” its “Essential Patent Claims to the
9 extent necessary to use, make, have made, offer for sale, sell, and affiliates including
10 Dishimport” products complaint with MoCA standards on a “non-exclusive, non-sub-
11 licensable, world wide” basis “on fair, reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms and
12 conditions (collectively, ‘RAND’) . . .” Entropic has breached section 5.1.1 at least
13 because it has failed to provide DISH with a RAND-compliant license offer.

14 99. Entropic has also breached section 7.2 of the MoCA IPR Policy. Section
15 7.2 provides that “terminated Alliance Part[ies] shall be entitled to request or require
16 any Alliance Party to license such Alliance Party’s Essential Patent Claims under
17 Section 5.1 (RAND Licenses), but only to the extent necessary to use, make, have
18 made, offer for sale, sell and import” products complaint with MoCA standards
19 “approved by the Board of Directors prior to such expiration or termination.” To the
20 extent DISH products implement any part of any MoCA Standard, Entropic has
21 breached section 7.2 at least because it has failed to provide DISH with a RAND-
22 compliant license offer.

23 100. DISH has been harmed by Entropic’s breaches of the MoCA IPR Policy.
24 By way of example, DISH is forced to expend considerable sums of money and other
25 resources to defend itself in the present suit—resources that DISH would not have
26 had to expend had Entropic complied with the terms of the MoCA IPR Policy. DISH
27 has also suffered diminution of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 recover these damages, as well as any additional relief that may be appropriate or
2 required to address Entropic's breaches.

3 **COUNT IV**

4 **(As Against Counter-Defendant MaxLinear)**

5 **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

6 101. DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in Its
7 Counterclaim Paragraphs 1-100 above, as if set forth fully herein.

8 546.102. The MoCA IPR Policy constitutes a valid, enforceable, and
9 binding contract governed by the laws of California.

10 103. One of those contractual commitments is Original Entropic agreed to the
11 terms of the MoCA IPR Policy by virtue of executing a Promoter Member Agreement
12 (or similar agreement). As Original Entropic was a predecessor-in-interest to the
13 Asserted Patents, the promises made by Original Entropic to comply with the terms
14 of the MoCA IPR Policy became binding on MaxLinear when MaxLinear acquired
15 the Asserted Patents in 2015.

16 104. Moreover, MaxLinear itself agreed to the terms of the MoCA IPR Policy
17 at least by virtue of executing a Promoter Member Agreement and an Associate
18 Agreement (or similar agreements).

19 105. As set forth above (paragraphs 58-63), DISH Technologies has standing
20 to enforce the MoCA IPR policy as a former member of MoCA.

21 106. As set forth above (paragraphs 64-74), the DISH Defendants are
22 intended third-party beneficiaries of the MoCA IPR Policy and have standing to
23 enforce its terms.

24 107. To the extent the MoCA IPR Policy imposes any obligations on DISH,
25 DISH has discharged them. By way of example, DISH made a request, in writing,
26 for a RAND-compliant license offer.

27 547.108. MaxLinear has breached Section 5.1.2 of the MoCA IPR Policy.
28 Section 5.1.2 provides that "[a]ny sale, assignment or ~~other~~ transfer by an Alliance

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 Party ~~or its Affiliates~~... to an unaffiliated third party of an Essential Patent Claim
2 shall be subject to the terms in this IPR Policy.... ~~[A]ny~~” and “any agreement for
3 transferring or assigning Essential Patent Claims ~~includes~~include a provision that such
4 transfer or assignment is subject to existing licenses and obligations to license
5 imposed on the Alliance Party by this Agreement and the Alliance Bylaws.” ~~MoCA~~
6 IPR Policy § 5.1.2.” MaxLinear breached Section 5.1.2 at least because it failed to
7 transfer the Asserted Patents “subject to the terms” of the IPR Policy, nor did
8 MaxLinear include any provision in the agreement transferring the Asserted Patents
9 to Entropic that the transfer was subject to the obligations imposed by the MoCA IPR
10 Policy.

11 109. MaxLinear has also breached Section 4.1.2 of the MoCA IPR Policy. In
12 Section 4.1.2, MaxLinear “represent[ed], warrant[ed], and agree[d] that it has not and
13 will not intentionally transfer or otherwise encumber its patents that reasonably may
14 contain Essential Patent Claims for the purpose of circumventing the obligation to
15 grant licenses contained in this IPR Policy.” MaxLinear breached Section 4.1.2 by
16 transferring the Asserted Patents without requiring Entropic to agree to license the
17 Asserted Patents on RAND terms and (as described more fully below) by attempting
18 to intentionally circumvent the RAND promise.

19 110. DISH has been harmed by MaxLinear’s breach of the MoCA IPR Policy.
20 By way of example, DISH is forced to expend considerable sums of money and other
21 resources to defend itself in the present suit—resources that would not have had to
22 expend had MaxLinear complied with the terms of the MoCA IPR Policy. DISH has
23 also suffered diminution of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to recover
24 these damages, as well as any additional relief that may be appropriate or required to
25 address MaxLinear’s breach.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

COUNT V

(As Against Counter-Defendant MaxLinear)

FRAUD AND NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

548. ~~As set forth above, Entropic Communications Inc. was, and MaxLinear is, an Alliance Party who transferred the Asserted Patents to Entropic, and therefore, Entropic and MaxLinear should be bound by the MoCA IPR Policy under MoCA IPR Policy § 5.1.2.~~

111. ~~On information and belief, the assignments of the Asserted Patents from Entropic Communications Inc. directly or indirectly via MaxLinear to Entropic do not contain “DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in its Counterclaim Paragraphs 1-110 above, as if set forth fully herein.~~

112. ~~On information and belief and as set forth above, MaxLinear represented to the members of MoCA, their affiliates, and potential implementors of MoCA standards—including DISH—that it would license the Asserted Patents under RAND terms and conditions and ensure any future owners of the Asserted Patents would be obligated to offer licenses under RAND terms and conditions. On information and belief, such statements were made to induce companies such as DISH to adopt and incorporate MoCA standards into their businesses, thus locking the companies into MoCA technologies.~~

113. ~~On information and belief, MaxLinear’s representations that it would license the Asserted Patents on RAND terms were false at the time MaxLinear made them. At minimum, on information and belief, these representations were false and made by MaxLinear without any reasonable grounds for the truth of the representation.~~

114. ~~That MaxLinear knew that its representations were false, or at least lacked reasonable grounds for believing them true, is evidenced by MaxLinear’s behavior after its acquisition of Original Entropic.~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 115. Prior to MaxLinear's acquisition, Original Entropic had made specific
2 statements in its Annual Reports affirming its obligation to license the Asserted
3 Patents on RAND Terms. In its 2012 Annual Report, for example, Original Entropic
4 stated "[i]n connection with our membership in MoCA, we are required to license any
5 of our patent claims that are essential to implement the MoCA specification to other
6 MoCA members under reasonable and non-discriminatory terms."

7 116. On information and belief, MaxLinear knew of Original Entropic's
8 statements prior to acquiring Original Entropic. Moreover, on information and belief,
9 including at least because of MaxLinear's own participation in MoCA, MaxLinear
10 was aware of the MoCA IPR Policy and its obligations. However, in its own Annual
11 Report in 2015, MaxLinear touted its acquisition of Original Entropic and the MoCA
12 patents without disclosing encumbrances on those patents.

13 117. That MaxLinear knew that its representations were false, or at least
14 lacked reasonable grounds for believing them true, is further evidenced by
15 MaxLinear's transfer of the Asserted Patents to Entropic.

16 549.118. As discussed above, Section 5.1.2 of the MoCA IPR Policy
17 requires that "any agreement for transferring or assigning Essential Patent Claims
18 include a provision that such transfer or assignment is subject to existing licenses and
19 obligations to license imposed on the Alliance Party" as the MoCA IPR Policy
20 requires. MoCA IPR Policy § 5.1.2. Moreover, as set forth above, Entropic's failure
21 to offer a license to the Asserted Patents on RAND terms and conditions to Dish
22 California reflects Entropic's belief that it is under no obligation to do so by this
23 Agreement and the Alliance Bylaws." MaxLinear not only failed to include such a
24 provision, but also represented that the Asserted Patents were not encumbered by a
25 RAND obligation. More specifically, MaxLinear warranted that the only known
26 encumbrances on the Asserted Patents were two license agreements unrelated to the
27 MoCA IPR Policy.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 119. That MaxLinear knew that its representations were false, or at least
2 lacked reasonable grounds for believing them true, is further evidenced by Entropic's
3 failure to offer DISH a license to the Asserted Patents under RAND terms, despite
4 repeated requests by DISH. [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 120. DISH reasonably relied on the representations of MoCA participants,
11 such as and including MaxLinear, that such participants in standard setting would
12 honor their commitments under the MoCA IPR Policy when deciding what
13 technologies to utilize in its business.

14 121. DISH has been harmed by MaxLinear's fraudulent or negligently-false
15 representations, at least because the significant cost of the instant litigation may have
16 been avoided if Entropic offered DISH a license to the Asserted Patents under RAND
17 terms and conditions. DISH's reliance on MaxLinear's representations is a
18 substantial factor in causing this harm because, absent a representation to license on
19 RAND terms, DISH may have elected to use different technology.

20 122. Due to MaxLinear's fraud and negligent misrepresentations, DISH has
21 suffered damages in the form of costs and expenses associated with litigation and
22 diminution of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to recover these
23 damages, as well as any additional relief that may be appropriate or required to
24 address Entropic's and MaxLinear's tortious conduct.

25 ~~550. —COUNT VI Every party using technology contained within the MoCA~~
26 ~~standards is an intended beneficiary of Entropic Communications, Inc.'s, Entropic's,~~
27 ~~and MaxLinear's voluntary contractual commitments to MoCA, including the~~
28 ~~commitment to grant licenses on RAND terms to all that make, use, or sell products~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 ~~supporting the MoCA standards as well as to include provisions binding future~~
2 ~~assignees to the same commitment.~~

3 ~~551. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists~~
4 ~~a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance~~
5 ~~of a declaratory judgment voiding the assignment of the patents to Entropic.~~

6 **COUNT IV: BREACH OF MAXLINEAR'S AND ENTROPIC'S RAND**

7 **CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENT**

8 **Counterclaim Plaintiff Dish California**

9 **(As Against Counter-Defendants Entropic and MaxLinear)**

10 **FRAUD ARISING FROM A CIVIL CONSPIRACY**

11 123. DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in its
12 Counterclaim Paragraphs 1-122 above, as if set forth fully herein.

13 124. On information and belief, both Entropic and MaxLinear conspired to
14 commit fraud and negligent misrepresentation to avoid having to license the Asserted
15 Patents on RAND terms in violation of the MoCA IPR Policy. On information and
16 belief, the purpose of this conspiracy was to launder the Asserted Patents, thus
17 “washing” them of the RAND encumbrances set forth in the MoCA IPR Policy.

18 125. As discussed above (paragraphs 111-122), MaxLinear made fraudulent
19 and/or negligently false representations that it would license patents essential to the
20 practice of MoCA standards on RAND terms.

21 126. On information and belief, MaxLinear transferred ownership of the
22 Asserted Patents to Entropic to further its fraudulent scheme. On information and
23 belief, the other aim of the transfer of ownership of the Asserted Patents was to breach
24 the MoCA IPR Policy.

25 127. On information and belief, the Conspirators had actual knowledge of the
26 planned tort of inducing breach of contract, fraud, and/or negligent misrepresentation
27 and concurred in the tortious scheme with knowledge of its unlawful
28 purpose. ~~Affirmative and~~ On information and belief, the Conspirators agreed and

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 intended that breach of contract, fraud, and/or negligent misrepresentation be
2 furthered and/or committed.

3 128. The intent of the Conspirators can be inferred by the knowledge each had
4 regarding the nature of the Asserted Patents (for example, MaxLinear's statements in
5 its Annual Reports regarding the patent portfolio it acquired from Original Entropic
6 and Entropic's allegations of infringement arising from the alleged use of MoCA
7 standards); and from the knowledge each had (or should have had) regarding MoCA's
8 IPR policies. In other words, despite apparently believing that the Asserted Patents
9 were essential to the practice of MoCA standards, the Conspirators attempted to
10 "wash" the patents of any RAND obligations by transferring them to Entropic without
11 any indication of the RAND encumbrances.

12 ~~552.129.~~ Additional Defenses and Counterclaim Paragraphs 480-551,
13 ~~above, as if set forth fully herein.~~ intent of the Conspirators can be inferred by the
14 financial relationship between them. By way of example, despite transferring
15 ownership of the Asserted Patents to Entropic, MaxLinear has a significant financial
16 stake in the outcome of Entropic's litigation and licensing efforts. Yet, rather than
17 pursuing licensing itself, MaxLinear elected to transfer ownership of the Asserted
18 Patents to another entity whose only purpose is to bring lawsuits with at least the
19 purpose of financial gain. This transfer allowed MaxLinear to avoid the expense of
20 litigation, while burdening DISH with the costs of this lawsuit.

21 ~~553.—Dish California~~DISH has been harmed by virtue of its affiliation with
22 ~~EchoStar, a founding member of MoCA in 2004, Dish California is a beneficiary of~~
23 the MoCA IPR Policy.

24 ~~554.—For the reasons stated above, on information and belief, Entropic~~
25 ~~and conspiracy between~~ MaxLinear are bound by the MoCA IPR Policy.

26 ~~555.—Under the MoCA IPR Policy, on information and belief, Entropic and~~
27 ~~MaxLinear were contractually obligated to offer Dish California such a license on~~
28 ~~RAND terms and conditions upon receipt of such a request rather than file or maintain~~

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 a lawsuit if Entropic's admission that the Asserted Patents are standard essential
2 patents for and Entropic, at least one version of the MoCA standard is true.

3 556. Without making a RAND licensing offer to Dish California, Entropic
4 filed this lawsuit against Dish California on February 10, 2023, alleging that Dish
5 California infringes twelve patents that Entropic alleges are essential to at least one
6 MoCA standard.

7 557.130. Entropic's filing because the significant cost of the instant lawsuit
8 and attempt to recoup damages litigation may have been avoided if Entropic offered
9 DISH a license to the Asserted Patents under 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285, without
10 offering to license the Asserted Patents to Dish California on RAND terms and
11 conditions, is a material breach of the MoCA IPR Policy.

12 558.131. Due to Entropic's the conspiracy between Entropic and
13 MaxLinear's breach of the MoCA IPR Policy, Dish California MaxLinear, DISH has
14 suffered damages in the form of costs and expenses associated with litigation and
15 diminution of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to recover these
16 damages, as well as any additional relief that may be appropriate or required to
17 address Entropic's and MaxLinear's tortious conduct.

18 —
19 **COUNT VII** **Dish California is entitled to recover these damages, as well as any**
20 **additional relief that may be appropriate or required to address Entropic's and**
21 **MaxLinear's breaches.**

22 **(As Against Counter-Defendant MaxLinear)**

23 **QUASI-CONTRACT FOR RESTITUTION / UNJUST ENRICHMENT**

24 559. **DISH**

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

COUNT V: MAXLINEAR'S AND ENTROPIC'S FRAUD AND NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

560.132. Counterclaim Plaintiff Dish California incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in Affirmative and Additional Defenses and its Counterclaim Paragraphs 480-559,1-131, above, as if set forth fully herein.

561.—On information and belief—and as set forth above, Entropic Communications Inc. and MaxLinear represented to the members of MoCA and their affiliates—including Dish California—that they would license the Asserted Patents under RAND terms and conditions and ensure any future owners of the Asserted Patents would be obligated to offer licenses under RAND terms and conditions.

562.133. Entropic Communications Inc.'s and MaxLinear's representations to that effect were false as shown by Entropic's failure to offer Dish California a license to the Asserted Patents under RAND terms., MaxLinear has received significant benefits from its participation in MoCA. On information and belief, Entropic Communications Inc. and MaxLinear knew their representations were false at the time such representations were made or such representations were made recklessly and without regard these benefits include (for the truth of such representations. On information and belief, Entropic Communications Inc. and MaxLinear had no reasonable grounds for believing the representation was true when it was made,example) substantial sales of its MoCA-compatible products as well as reputational benefits such as its claim to be a pioneer in the development of MoCA technology.¹⁹

134. On information and belief, the benefits received by MaxLinear were at DISH's expense.

¹⁹ "MaxLinear to Acquire Entropic, Reaffirms its Fourth Quarter 2014 Guidance and Provides Outlook for the First Quarter 2015," available at <https://www.maxlinear.com/news/press-releases/2015/maxlinear-to-acquire-entropic,-reaffirms-its-fourt> (last visited January 10, 2023).

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 135. For example, as acknowledged by Original Entropic Communications
2 Inc. made this representation intending Dish California, there existed many possible
3 technologies that could have been adopted at the time MoCA was being developed
4 and pursued. As Original Entropic acknowledged in its December 31, 2014, Form
5 10-K SEC filing:

6 With regard to Connectivity solutions, some service providers,
7 ODMs and OEMs have adopted, and others may adopt,
8 multimedia content delivery solutions that rely on the
9 representation, and Dish California, in fact, relied on this
10 representation as shown by its affiliation with a MoCA member
11 and incorporation of certain technologies other than the MoCA
12 standard or may choose to wait for the introduction of products
13 and technologies that serve as a replacement or substitute for, or
14 represent an improvement over, MoCA-based solutions. The
15 alternative technology in solutions which compete with MoCA-
16 based solutions include Ethernet, HomePNA, HomePlug AV
17 and Wi-Fi. It is critical to our success that additional service
18 providers, including telecommunications carriers, digital
19 broadcast satellite service providers and cable operators, adopt
20 the MoCA standard for home networking and deploy MoCA
21 solutions to their customers. If the market for MoCA-based
22 solutions does not continue to develop or develops more slowly
23 than we expect, or if we make errors in predicting adoption and
24 deployment rates for these solutions, our revenues may be
25 significantly adversely affected. Our operating results may also
26 be adversely affected by any delays in consumer upgrade to HD
27 services, delays in consumer adoption of OTT services, or if the
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 market for OTT services develops more slowly than we
2 expect.²⁰

3 563.136. To induce the wide adoption of MoCA standards, including by
4 DISH, MaxLinear and the other MoCA members asserted they would agree to license
5 essential patents on RAND terms. In reliance on that assurance, DISH made
6 considerable expenditures that enriched MaxLinear to adopt MoCA technology into
7 its products.business.

8 564. Entropic Communications Inc.'s representation harmed Dish California
9 at least due to the significant cost of the instant litigation which may have been
10 avoided if Entropic offered Dish California a license to the Asserted Patents under
11 RAND terms and conditions.

12 137. On information and belief, Entropic is the successor to Entropic
13 Communications Inc. and The benefits MaxLinear such that recognition of the fiction
14 of separate corporate existence would foster an injustice and that Entropic may be
15 deemed liable for the obligations of Entropic Communications Inc. and received were
16 obtained as a result of its false, misleading and/or mistaken representations and
17 requests. As discussed above (paragraphs 111-122) MaxLinear made false
18 representations, including misrepresenting to the public it would license essential
19 patents on RAND terms.

20 138. These actions created, at minimum, a quasi-contract that MaxLinear has
21 now breached by retaining the benefits conferred unjustly. Equity and good
22 conscience accordingly demands that MaxLinear disgorge and provide restitution of
23 any and all monies and profits from MaxLinear's unjust enrichment.

24
25
26
27 20

28 <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1227930/000122793015000006/entr2014123110-k.htm>

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

COUNT VIII

(As Against Counter-Defendants MaxLinear and Entropic)

COMBINATION IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE

139. DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in its Counterclaim Paragraphs 1-138, above, as if set forth fully herein.

140. Section 1 of the Sherman Act makes unlawful “[e]very contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations.” 15 U.S.C. § 1. As the Ninth Circuit has articulated, “[t]o state a claim under Section 1 of the Sherman Act,” a plaintiff must plead facts that at least one purpose of the assignment of would prove “(1) a contract, combination or conspiracy amongst two or more persons or distinct business entities; (2) by which the persons intended to harm or restrain trade or commerce among the several states, or with foreign nations; and (3) which actually injures competition.” *Kendall v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.*, 518 F.3d 1042, 1047 (9th Cir. 2008).

141. There is a market in the United States for home networking. Home networking devices might consist of, for example, routers or other devices that allow users to connect laptops and phones to the Internet. MoCA standards provide one way that users might connect various devices to the Internet at home through the use of coaxial cables that may already exist in their home.

142. There is also a market in the United States for home television services. Home television services may comprise the delivery of television channels through a wired cable connection to a user’s home, through the use of satellites and satellite dishes, or over the Internet.

143. Consumers will pay more for more reliable and faster home networking, and more reliable television service. For example, makers of home networking equipment routinely tout the speed that their devices will allow consumers to use; and

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 home television providers tout the reliability and ease-of-setup for home television
2 services.

3 565.144. As discussed above, MaxLinear executed a Patent Purchase
4 Agreement with Entropic that transferred ownership of the Asserted Patents. As also
5 discussed above (see paragraphs 124-131) MaxLinear and Entropic entered into this
6 agreement in an attempt to “wash” the Asserted Patents was for escaping the
7 obligations to offer a of any obligation to license underon RAND terms—, despite
8 each’s obligation to do so pursuant to the MoCA IPR Policy.

9 145. Due to As courts have explained, when a subsequent purchase of RAND-
10 committed patents attempts to “reject[] FRAND,” the patent owner becomes “an
11 unconstrained an unlawful monopolist in violation of the antitrust laws.” *HTC Corp.*
12 *v. ICom GmbH & Co., KG*, No. CV 08-1897 (RMC), 2010 WL 11719073, at *6
13 (D.D.C. Nov. 5, 2010). Accordingly, because (on information and belief), a purpose
14 of the Patent Purchase Agreement was to avoid a RAND obligation, the intent of
15 Entropic and MaxLinear was to engage in monopolistic behavior and unreasonably
16 harm competition in the market for home networking and home television services.
17 More specifically, on information and belief, Entropic and MaxLinear attempted to
18 “wash” the asserted patents of RAND-obligations in order to charge exorbitantly-high
19 licensing fees (such as the \$1 billion dollar demand made by Entropic)—thus driving
20 up the cost of home networking and home television services for end users.

21 146. Competition in the relevant markets has been injured as a result of
22 Entropic’s and MaxLinear’s behavior. By way of example, MaxLinear’s and
23 Entropic’s behavior forces the providers of home television services to engage in
24 expensive litigation (rather than negotiate a RAND license)—costs that must
25 eventually be passed on to end-users. Moreover, if Entropic gets its demand for \$1
26 billion, those costs must also be additionally passed on to end-users of home television
27 services, further driving up the costs. These additional costs reduce or eliminate the
28 potential price benefit to consumer that MoCA based networking provides as

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 compared to competing technologies, such as recent generations of WiFi based
2 products. Meanwhile, MaxLinear is able to charge a higher rate for its own MoCA
3 compatible products due to the artificial inflation of market prices.

4 566.147. As a direct and proximate result of Entropic's and MaxLinear's
5 fraud and negligent misrepresentations, Dish California unlawful restraint of trade,
6 DISH has been harmed in an amount to be established at trial. DISH has suffered
7 damages in the form of costs and expenses associated with litigation and diminution
8 of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to recover these damages, as well
9 as any additional relief that may be appropriate or required to address Entropic's and
10 MaxLinear's illegal conduct.

11
12 **COUNT IX**

13 **(As Against Counter-Defendants MaxLinear and Entropic By Dish California-)**

14 **VIOLATION OF THE CARTWRIGHT ACT**

15 148. DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in its
16 Counterclaim Paragraphs 1-147, above, as if set forth fully herein.

17 149. The California Cartwright Act prohibits "trusts," which are defined as
18 combinations of capital, skill, or acts by two or more persons to, inter alia, create or
19 carry out restrictions in trade or commerce. See California Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720.
20 This statute is the California counterpart to section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act,
21 and California courts have looked to federal law when interpreting the provisions of
22 this act. Thus, like section 1 of the Sherman Act, the Cartwright Act "prohibits
23 combinations in unreasonable restraint of trade." Marsh v. Anesthesia Servs. Med.
24 Grp., Inc., 200 Cal. App. 4th 480, 493 (2011).

25 150. As discussed above, there is a market in the United States for both home
26 networking and for home television service. These markets also exist in California.

27 151. Dish California participates in the market for home television service in
28 California.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 152. As discussed above, MaxLinear executed a Patent Purchase Agreement
2 with Entropic that transferred ownership of the Asserted Patents. As also discussed
3 above (see paragraphs 123-131) MaxLinear and Entropic entered into this agreement
4 in an attempt to “wash” the Asserted Patents of any obligation to license on RAND
5 terms, despite each’s obligation to do so pursuant to the MoCA IPR Policy.

6 153. As courts have explained, when a subsequent purchase of RAND-
7 committed patents attempts to “reject[] FRAND,” the patent owner becomes “an
8 unconstrained an unlawful monopolist in violation of the antitrust laws.” *HTC Corp.*
9 *v. IPCOM GmbH & Co., KG*, No. CV 08-1897 (RMC), 2010 WL 11719073, at *6
10 (D.D.C. Nov. 5, 2010). Accordingly, because (on information and belief), the purpose
11 of the Patent Purchase Agreement was to avoid a RAND obligation, the intent of
12 Entropic and MaxLinear was to engage in monopolistic behavior and unreasonably
13 harm competition in the market for home networking and home television services.
14 More specifically, on information and belief, Entropic and MaxLinear attempted to
15 “wash” the asserted patents of RAND-obligations in order to charge exorbitantly-high
16 licensing fees (such as the \$1 billion dollar demand made by Entropic)—thus driving
17 up the cost of home networking and home television services for end users.

18 154. Competition in the relevant markets has been injured as a result of
19 Entropic’s and MaxLinear’s behavior. By way of example, MaxLinear’s and
20 Entropic’s behavior forces the providers of home television services to engage in
21 expensive litigation (rather than negotiate a RAND license)—costs that must
22 eventually be passed on to end-users. Moreover, if Entropic gets its demand for \$1
23 billion, those costs must also be additionally passed on to end-users of home television
24 services, further driving up the costs. These additional costs reduce or eliminate the
25 potential price benefit to consumers that MoCA based networking provides as
26 compared to competing technologies, such as recent generations of WiFi based
27 products. Meanwhile, MaxLinear is able to charge a higher rate for its own MoCA
28 compatible products due to the artificial inflation of market prices.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

disruption of the contractual relationship occurred through Entropic's failure to offer Dish California a license to the Asserted Patents under RAND terms and conditions and failure to include a provision under MoCA IPR Policy § 5.1.2; and (e) damages to Dish California have occurred at least through the expense of fees and costs of this litigation and reputational harm. COUNT X
(As Against Counter-Defendants MaxLinear and Entropic)

PATENT MISUSE

~~571.~~ DISH

~~COUNT VII: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT THE ASSERTED~~
~~PATENTS ARE UNENFORCEABLE AGAINST DISH CALIFORNIA~~

~~572.156.~~ Counterclaim Plaintiff Dish California incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in Affirmative and Additional Defenses and its Counterclaim Paragraphs ~~480-571,1-155,~~ above, as if set forth fully herein.

157. The Asserted Patents are unenforceable against Dish California because of estoppel, laches, waiver, unclean hands, federal Patent Laws make it unlawful for the owner of a patent exhaustion, implied license, and/or other equitable doctrines. to attempt to extent the monopoly right granted by a patent beyond its appropriate bounds. A finding of Patent Misuse renders a patent unenforceable.

~~573.158.~~ MaxLinear and Entropic Communications, Inc., have engaged in Patent Misuse by, inter alia, attempting to "wash" the Asserted Patents of RAND encumbrances. As discussed previously, Entropic and MaxLinear engaged in standards setting misconduct, including without limitation Entropic's breach of its commitments to license any essential patents on RAND terms rendering devised a scheme to transfer the Asserted Patents unenforceable if Entropic's admission from MaxLinear to Entropic without including any indication that the Asserted Patents are standard essential patents for at least one version of were encumbered by the RAND obligations imposed by the MoCA standard is true. IPR Policy.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

574. — As set forth above, Entropic has chosen to engage in litigation rather than good faith negotiation to reach agreement on RAND terms and conditions for Dish California to license the Asserted Patents.

575. — Entropic has failed to provide Dish California with RAND terms and conditions for a license to the Asserted Patents.

576. — As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment to this Court holding the Asserted Patents are unenforceable against Dish California.

159. As a direct and proximate result of Entropic's and MaxLinear's misuse of the Asserted Patents, DISH has been harmed in an amount to be established at trial. DISH has suffered damages in the form of costs and expenses associated with litigation and diminution of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to recover these damages, as well as any additional relief that may be appropriate or required to address Entropic's and MaxLinear's illegal conduct.

COUNT XI

(As Against Counter-Defendants MaxLinear and Entropic)

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE

160. DISH incorporates and realleges the allegations set forth in its Counterclaim Paragraphs 1-159 above, as if set forth fully herein.

161. The California Business & Professions Code, section 17200 et seq. make it unlawful for any person to engage in unfair competition, which includes "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." "The 'unlawful' practices prohibited by section 17200 are any practices forbidden by law, be it civil or criminal, federal, state, or municipal, statutory, regulatory, or court-made. It is not necessary that the predicate law provide for private civil enforcement." *Watson Labs., Inc. v. Rhone-Poulenc Rorer, Inc.*, 178 F. Supp. 2d 1099, 1120 (C.D. Cal. 2001).

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 162. As discussed above, Entropic and MaxLinear have engaged in actions
2 made unlawful under at least Section of the Sherman Act, the Cartwright Act, and
3 under the Patent Laws of the United States, by engaging in an assignment of the
4 Asserted Patents in an attempt to “wash” them of RAND encumbrances.

5 163. As a direct and proximate result of Entropic’s and MaxLinear’s unlawful
6 behavior, DISH has been harmed in an amount to be established at trial. DISH has
7 suffered damages in the form of costs and expenses associated with litigation and
8 diminution of reputation in the marketplace. DISH is entitled to recover these
9 damages, as well as any additional relief that may be appropriate or required to
10 address Entropic’s and MaxLinear’s illegal conduct.

11
12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 ~~577.164.~~Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, ~~Dish~~
14 ~~California~~DISH demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, ~~Dish-California~~DISH prays that:

- A. Entropic take nothing by way of its Complaint and the same be dismissed with prejudice;
- B. All damages, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, or other relief sought by Entropic be denied;
- C. Judgment be entered that each asserted claim of Entropic's Asserted Patents is invalid and/or unenforceable;
- D. Judgment be entered that each of the asserted Entropic U.S. patents declared by it to be essential to the MoCA Standards is unenforceable;
- E. Judgment be entered establishing that ~~Dish-California~~DISH is entitled to any necessary license to Entropic's Asserted Patents on RAND terms;
- F. Judgment be entered establishing the terms of any necessary RAND license to the Entropic's Asserted Patents;
- G. Judgment be entered voiding any assignment of Entropic's Asserted Patents to Entropic;
- H. The Court grant injunctive relief and/or specific performance of the MoCA IPR Policy requiring that Entropic make available to ~~Dish-California~~DISH a license to the Asserted Patents on RAND terms;
- I. Judgment be entered that Entropic has breached its RAND contractual commitment;
- J. Judgment be entered that ~~Dish-California~~MaxLinear has breached the MoCA IPR Policy;
- K. Judgement that Entropic and MaxLinear have engaged in unlawful monopolistic behavior in violation of federal and California anti-trust laws;
- L. Judgment that Entropic and MaxLinear have engaged in conduct made unlawful by section 17200 of the California Business & Professional Code;

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 J.M. Judgment be entered that DISH has not infringed, contributed to the
2 infringement of, or induced others to infringe, either directly or indirectly,
3 any valid or enforceable claims of Entropic's Asserted Patents, willfully or
4 otherwise;

5 K.N. Judgment be entered awarding Dish-CaliforniaDISH damages and pre-
6 judgment and post-judgment interest for Entropic's breaches of its RAND
7 obligations on Entropic's Asserted Patents;

8 L.O. Judgment be entered awarding Dish-CaliforniaDISH damages and pre-
9 judgment and post-judgment interest for Entropic's and MaxLinear's
10 breaches of its RAND obligations on Entropic's Asserted Patents;

11 M.P. Judgment be entered as the Court finds necessary to redress injury to
12 Dish-CaliforniaDISH including, but not limited to, disgorgement of ill-
13 gotten monies from Entropic and MaxLinear's for their breaches of RAND
14 obligations;

15 N.Q. Judgment be entered for Dish-CaliforniaDISH for recovery for
16 Entropic's fraud, negligent misrepresentation, as well as any additional
17 relief that may be appropriate or required to address Entropic's tortious
18 conduct;

19 O.R. Judgment be entered for Dish-CaliforniaDISH for recovery for
20 MaxLinear's fraud, negligent misrepresentation, as well as any additional
21 relief that may be appropriate or required to address MaxLinear's tortious
22 conduct;

23 P.S. Judgment be entered holdingfor DISH for Entropic and MaxLinear liable
24 forMaxLinear's conspiracy to commit fraud, as well as any additional relief
25 that may be appropriate to address the tortious conduct of Entropic
26 Communications Inc., MaxLinear Communications LLC, MaxLinear Inc.,
27 Exar Corporation, Excalibur Acquisition Corporation, and Excalibur
28 Subsidiary, LLC;conspiracy;

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 Q.T. Judgment be entered that the Asserted Patents are Unenforceable Against
2 Dish California;DISH;

3 R.U. Judgment be entered finding that this is an exceptional case under 35
4 U.S.C. § 285;

5 S.V. The Court grant Dish CaliforniaDISH all reasonable attorneys' fees,
6 experts' fees, and costs; and

7 T. The Court grant Dish CaliforniaDISH such further relief as the Court deems
8 proper and just.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

1 Dated: January 31, 2024

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

2
3 By: /s/ ~~Christopher S. Marchese~~ Oliver J. Richards

4 Oliver Richards (SBN 310972)
orichards@fr.com

5 John-Paul Fryckman (SBN 317591)
fryckman@fr.com

6 Fish & Richardson P.C.
12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92130
Tel: (858) 678-5070

9 Christopher S. Marchese (SBN 170239)
marchese@fr.com

10 Tyler R. Train (SBN 318998)
train@fr.com

11 633 West Fifth Street, 26th Floor
12 Los Angeles, CA 90071
13 Tel: (213) 533-4240

14 Adam R. Shartzter (*pro hac vice*)
shartzter@fr.com

15 Ruffin B. Cordell (*pro hac vice*)
cordell@fr.com

16 Richard A. Sterba (*pro hac vice*)
sterba@fr.com

17 Ralph A. Phillips (*pro hac vice*)
rphillips@fr.com

18 shartzter@fr.com
19 Michael J. Ballanco (*pro hac vice*)
ballanco@fr.com

20 Taylor C. Burgener (SBN 348769)
burgener@fr.com

21 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
22 1000 Maine Ave., SW, Suite 1000
23 Washington, DC 20024
Tel: (202) 783-5070

24 David M. Barkan (SBN 160825)
barkan@fr.com

25 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
26 500 Arguello Street, Suite 400
27 Redwood City, CA 94063
28 Tel: (650) 839-5070

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT PROPOSED TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL

Ashley A. Bolt (*pro hac vice*)
bolt@fr.com
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1180 Peachtree Street NE, 21st Floor
Atlanta, GA 30309
Tel: (404) 892-5005

Aaron P. Pirouznia (*pro hac vice*)
pirouznia@fr.com
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel: (214) 292-4073
Fax: (214) 747-2091

~~John Paul Fryckman (SBN 317591)~~
~~fryckman@fr.com~~
~~Fish & Richardson P.C.~~
~~12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400~~
~~San Diego, CA 92130~~
~~Tel: (858) 678-5070~~

Attorneys for Defendant
DISH Network Corporation; DISH
Network L.L.C.; Dish Network Service
L.L.C., Dish Network California Service
Corp., and DISH Technologies L.L.C..